The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXVI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1933 NUMBER 987

Contents

The Week 318

Editorials

The President's Money Policy 321
The Striking Farmers' Case 322
The Bear and the Eagle 323

General Articles

Preventive War? ..... H. N. Brailsford 325
Granite (verse) ..... Witter Bynner 326
Russia and World Revolution ..... Leon Trotsky 327
George Record ..... Amos Pinchot 329
The Ancestors (verse) ..... Allen Tate 331
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 332
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 333
Poetry of Defense ..... Stark Young 334

Correspondence 336

Reviews of Books

A Primer of Fascism ..... Malcolm Cowley 339
Ancien Régime ..... Mary M. Colum 340
In a Vermont Village ..... Clara G. Stillman 341
A Scholar's Plato ..... J. V. Mauzey 342
Book Notes 343

The Week

A SIGNIFICANT victory for the striking farmers and for consumers in general was won when the President signed the retail code after eliminating the proposed provision that no retailer could sell an article for less than 10 percent above its invoice cost. This is a technical matter, the meaning of which is not understood by the average reader, but the question whether such a provision should be included in the code had become a test case for those who were fighting in behalf of consumers and saw the necessity of keeping retail prices down while wages and farm incomes were boosted. Ten percent does not seem like a large mark-up; but in principle it meant a tendency to set prices so as to protect the least efficient in the industry and prevent reduction in distributive costs. Pressure would instantly have been exerted to increase the mark-up. And it would have been used as a precedent for cost-plus provisions all the way down from the primary producer to the ultimate consumer. We should have frozen all the inefficiencies and high costs in our haphazard system of distribution. In order to eliminate the admitted evil of "loss-leaders"—that is, selling one or two articles below cost to attract customers who would be overcharged for other things—the code was allowed to retain a provision forbidding sales at less than invoice cost, plus a percentage for labor cost, to be determined by a trade board. The controversy will now rage about the calculation of this percentage. Certainly much more needs to be done in the interest of consumers. The elimination of the 10-percent clause is important only as a small beginning—but it does show that the consumers have some power after all.

PRESIDENT Roosevelt's statement about unemployment in his radio speech gives every benefit of the doubt to the success of his program. Statistics about unemployment are notoriously shaky, and even those on employment are far from complete. But Mr. Roosevelt's statement that 12 or 13 millions were out of work last March and that, of these, 10 millions were earnestly seeking work seems less accurate than the estimate of the A. F. of L. that the unemployed numbered 13,500,000. Likewise there is a good deal of doubt that he is right in saying 4 millions have been reëmployed since then. The Bureau of Labor Statistics covers, by a sampling method, 20 million employees in manufacturing, mining and other industries, and of these it estimates that 2,700,000 workers have been reabsorbed. Add about 110,000 taken on by Class I railroads, and about 500,000 in agriculture—largely a seasonal increase. There is much less chance for reëmployment in the other occupations not covered by the Labor Department figures, such as governmental employees, teachers and employees of hospitals and other service institutions. The total of reëmployment is probably not far above 3,350,000.

NO BETTER illustration of the Alice-in-Wonderland economics under which we live has been seen recently than the complaint of the small independent oil producers regarding the provisions of the oil code. They argue that they are in danger of being ruined unless they are permitted to cut prices below those of the big companies. This is because, as they explain, the big companies have a large

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volume of business, and naturally charge a higher price for their product. Also, they spend large sums of money in advertising, which of course makes the price higher still. Shades of Adam Smith! What has become of the doctrine that quantity production resulted in a lower cost per unit? Or the accompanying theory that advertising brought about larger consumption, which in turn reduced the cost, and thus paid for itself without being a burden on poor John Citizen? The small independent oil men have come forward with the naïve plea that the government ought to establish two prices: one for unadvertised gasoline, and the other, silghtly higher, for gasoline which must bear the additional expense of advertising. We should like to hear an explanation of this from one of our Pollyanna economists whose proud boast it is that the present is the best of all possible economic systems.

THIS paragraph is intended for the purely philanthropic purpose of persuading our readers to purchase and examine copies of another periodical: namely, Good Housekeeping. We think they may find the next number or two highly enlightening. Good Housekeeping conducts a Bureau of Foods, Sanitation and Health, whose head is Dr. Walter H. Eddy. In the October issue of the magazine, Dr. Eddy pledged wholehearted support to the Copeland Bill, which will be submitted to the next Congress, and is designed to strengthen and extend the work of the present Pure Food and Drug Law, passed in 1906. The new bill is intended to curb false claims of food, drug and cosmetics manufacturers in advertising, as these false claims are already curbed in package labels. They want the right to go on making false claims and, in some cases, even poisoning their customers.

SINCE they buy hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of advertising space annually, they have great influence with magazines and newspapers. It would be perfectly amazing if they had failed to come down on the editors of Good Housekeeping like ten tons of brick, when they saw what Dr. Eddy had done. It would be equally miraculous if Good Housekeeping, owned by the completely commercially minded William Randolph Hearst, should stand by its guns. Much more logical would it be for Good Housekeeping to print, as soon as it is physically possible to do so, say in the December or January number, an article which pulled all the teeth of Dr. Eddy's fine, vigorous statement. We do not know, of course, whether this prophecy is correct; we merely call the situation to the attention of our readers and warn them that the fight over the Copeland Bill will be one of the hottest seen in many years.

NO RECENT propaganda campaign is more regrettable than that of the newspapers against signing a code under the N.R.A. The argument has been made that the press must be free, that the sort of licenses planned in Washington might infringe press freedom, and that therefore, in the sacred name of liberty, the publishers must resist the wicked General Johnson to the death. This is of course just a lot of highly polished hooey. What Washington proposes has nothing to do with freedom of the press, and the administration has in general been scrupulously careful to avoid any suggestion of censorship. Moreover, if the Roosevelt administration should decide to bring pressure on the publishers, it would not do so by means of licenses under the N.R.A. It would take much more subtle, and more effective, methods. What the publishers really object to in the code is exactly what other business men have objected to. They want to continue unfair trade practices. They want to go on working their employees for what are in many instances shockingly long hours, at shockingly low wages. Of particular importance is the fact that they want to continue to use children to deliver and sell papers under conditions which are often undesirable in the extreme. Some papers are now waging a propaganda campaign in regard to this last point, of which they ought to be heartily ashamed. They are using advertising space for this, and also other methods. For instance, The Louisville, Kentucky, Courier-Journal and Times are furnishing to their delivery boys copies of a form letter, to be signed by their patrons and mailed to General Johnson. This letter seriously misstates the terms of the newspaper code, making it appear much more drastic than it is. Shoddy activity of this sort is not the right course for the newspapers to follow to gain public sympathy for their plea that "the liberty of free speech" is endangered.

THOSE persons and organizations in the United States who have long opposed the recognition of Russia are, of course, boiling with rage at the turn which events have recently taken. The obvious immediate strategy for them is to seek to persuade the President that the only proper terms for recognition are those which Russia could not possibly accept. Failing this, they will try to get into the stipulations some of their own ideas about guarantees against propaganda, and so on. One of many rumors in circulation is that the professional patriots want the Russian government to be told to tell the Third International to order The Daily Worker, the Communist newspaper published in New York City, to suspend publication; or at the very least to stop criticizing the N.R.A. Such a suggestion is certainly too absurd for anybody except a professional witch-hunter to take seriously. Even if Moscow should be foolish enough to issue any such order, the editors of The Daily Worker would certainly not be idiotic enough to obey it. We take it for granted that if this ridiculous suggestion should ever get as far as the President, he will chuck it in the wastebasket—where it belongs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE New York City mayoralty campaign has changed its character decidedly in the past week. The Literary Digest poll, based on ballots sent to every registered voter in the city, indicates that Fiorello LaGuardia, the Fusion candidate, will probably win; his vote is about as large as the combined total of O'Brien, Tammany's wooden Indian, and McKee, the so-called independent Democratic candidate. The pretense, maintained for some time, that McKee was not endorsed by President Roosevelt, has now broken down. It is obvious that his candidacy represents an attempt on the part of the President, guided by the astute Mr. Farley, to take New York City away from Tammany. Mr. Roosevelt's action has broken the hearts of those progressive Republicans and independent liberals who supported him last year in the belief that he would rise superior to the strategems of Democratic party hacks like Mr. Farley. Moreover, even if McKee should win, it will not mean that Tammany has been reformed. The majority of the Manhattan district leaders, the real power in the organization, have evidently decided to betray Mr. Curry and have gone over to McKee. Under the circumstances, the only choice for intelligent New York voters is between Mr. LaGuardia and one of the radical candiates, of the Socialist and Communist parties. As The New Republic has previously observed, the voter's own philosophy should determine his choice in this election. New Yorkers who believe that reform is better than corruption will vote for LaGuardia, or split their ticket, keeping him at its head. Those who believe reform is never effective and that fundamental reorganization of society is the only hope, will vote a straight radical ticket.

SAMUEL UNTERMYER is president of the American League for the Defense of Jewish Rights, a branch of the World Jewish Economic Federation. One activity of the League is pushing the present boycott of German goods, which the Jews have instituted throughout the world. Percy S. Straus is president of R. H. Macy and Company, which owns very large department stores in New York City and elsewhere. Mr. Straus, although himself a Jew, does not approve of the boycott and on October 2 he published a large advertisement in the New York City newspapers setting forth in detail his reasons for believing that it is unwise. Mr. Untermyer and his associates, as was perhaps to be expected, disagreed with Mr. Straus, and they prepared another large advertisement as a reply, in the form of an open letter to Mr. Straus, signed by Mr. Untermyer. When, however, they submitted this advertisement to the papers they found that not one of them was willing to print it. The editors of The New Republic have read this proposed advertisement, and it seems to them well within the bounds of legitimate public controversy, though this of course is a matter of opinion. The procedure under which it was suppressed remains in dispute: Mr. Untermyer says that the newspapers referred the matter to Mr. Straus, who refused to permit its publication; Mr. Straus says that the papers had decided not to print it before he even saw it, though he uses, in a letter to Mr. Untermyer, the singular phrase: "You cannot expect me to assent to the publication of a statement of this character when on its face the press considered it unfit for publication." Mr. Untermyer points out that R. H. Macy and Company is an extremely important advertiser; he calls it "by far the most important advertiser in the city, and perhaps in the world." He considers that this is an incident where the newspapers suppressed an advertisement of legitimate public interest out of fear of an important advertiser (though he concedes that other department stores, which are taking the same stand as R. H. Macy and Company, doubtless also influenced the decision of the press).

THE New Republic telegraphed to all the leading New York newspapers inviting them to comment on Mr. Untermyer's charge; but up to the time of going to press, a reply has been received from only two of them. Mr. Louis Wiley, business manager of The New York Times, writes that

> the advertisement referred to was not accepted by The New York Times in pursuance of a long established rule. The New York Times does not accept advertisements attacking character or credit. The advertisement in question contained an implied invitation to our readers not to purchase goods at one store. Since we accept the advertisements of that company, we cannot in good faith print advice to our readers not to deal with it.

Ogden Reid, publisher of The New York Herald Tribune, telegraphs us:

> I regret that my absence from New York prevented my sending an earlier answer to your telegram. The advertisement to which you refer, signed by the American League for the Defense of Jewish Rights and of which Mr. Untermyer is the president, was not published by The New York Herald Tribune because it did not comply with one of our rules that no advertiser may in his copy attack another advertiser. I do not believe Mr. Untermyer said that R. H. Macy and Company caused all New York newspapers to suppress any advertisement. It would be too obvious a lie.

SPAIN will choose a new Cortes on November 19. Twelve million voters, more than half of them women, will vote for the first time and express their opinion of republican Spain. Economic problems have divided the people into three groups and there are three roads open to them. The Spain dominated by the Church, the Spain of feudal estates and political bosses, is supported by the Basque-Navarre, Agrarian and Conservative parties. The first two parties want a monarchy, the Conservatives a reactionary republic. The middle road, on the other hand, is advocated by Alejandro Lerroux with his Radical party on the extreme right and Manuel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Azaña with his Republican Action party on the Left. Between them are a number of other parties including the Radical-Socialists. A victory for Lerroux means paralyzing social legislation and non-enforcement of present laws. A victory for Azaña means a moderatively progressive bourgeois republic. Economic revolution is advocated by the Socialists and Communists. The latter are weak in numbers, but the Socialists are strong. They have broken their alliance with the purely republican parties. To them the issue is socialism or capitalism.

The President's Money Policy

IN THE President's radio speech on October 22, we have the first definite statement concerning his monetary policy which has been made since the renewed pressure for inflation. We have also the announcement of a new agency to help effectuate that policy. It is worth while to see, if we can, exactly what this announcement portends.

What will the President attempt? There are three objectives, two of which are immediate, the third postponed. The first immediate objective is to "restore price levels." "No one . . . believes that commodity prices, especially agricultural prices, are high enough yet." Thus Mr. Roosevelt leaves no doubt that increase of prices is still vigorously sought. The second immediate objective is to "restore a balance in the price structure so that farmers may exchange their products for the products of industry on a fairer exchange basis." This means that he does not desire all prices to rise by an equal amount. The prices of industrial products must rise less than those of farm products, or even perhaps be reduced. Internal balance among prices is necessary. The third objective is to be sought when these two have been achieved. "When we have restored the price level, we shall seek to establish and maintain a dollar which will not change its purchasing and debt-paying power during the succeeding generation." This is repeated from his message to the American delegation to the London Conference. Price stabilization after price restoration.

To what point will prices be "restored," before stabilization? No definite price level, such as that of 1926, is chosen as the goal. The desirable level will be set, not by a mere historical mark, but by what it will accomplish. It will be one "which will enable agriculture and industry once more to give work to the unemployed." And it will "make possible the payment of public and private debts more nearly at the price level at which they were incurred." Both these tests are highly flexible. Reasonably full employment might be possible without much increase in the average price index, or it might not be attained even if all prices were doubled or trebled. Much more is necessary to bring employment than a mere general rise of prices. And debts have been incurred at widely different price levels all the way from the low of last winter up to the high of 1920. Presumably the President will be satisfied with prices whenever "prosperity" returns, and does not want to be bound to any more rigid goal. The attainment of this goal may take one, two or three years; in any event it cannot be extremely rapid.

Will the President devalue the dollar soon, as a means to raising prices? No. This puts at rest a constant source of speculation and rumors. Mr. Roosevelt evidently does not believe prices can be raised, and stabilized after they are raised, by reducing permanently the gold content of the dollar. To "revalue the dollar" before prices rise, he says—and we believe correctly—would be putting the cart before the horse. Prices must rise first; then the dollar may be revalued. Fixing the gold content of the dollar is a measure of exchange stabilization, not of price change. We do not know where the dollar can be stabilized until we know what price level can be maintained. "To guess at a permanent gold valuation now would certainly require later changes caused by later facts."

What new devices will the President establish to control the gold value of the dollar? Two things will be done. First, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will buy newly mined gold in the United States. The price at which it will buy will be determined from time to time after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the President. Second, "whenever necessary to the end in view, we shall also buy or sell gold in the world market." "This is a policy and not an expedient. It is not to be used merely to offset a temporary fall in prices. We are thus continuing to move forward toward a managed currency." We gather from this that the President intends to continue to change the gold price of the dollar even after prices are "restored." There is certainly a strong hint that we shall never return to a fixed gold standard.

How does this differ from the "commodity dollar" plan of Professor Irving Fisher and others? They suggested continual changes in the legal gold value of the dollar, to counterbalance changes in commodity prices. This sounds like the same sort of device. The legal gold value of the dollar is the price at which the Treasury or the banks will buy or sell gold. Since we went off the gold standard, the Treasury and the banks are not allowed to sell. The President's scheme substitutes the R.F.C. as a buyer and seller. But with great limitations. When the United States is on the gold standard, you can take currency to any bank or to the Treasury and buy gold with it at a fixed price—so much gold of a certain fineness for a dollar. To "revalue" gold means changing that price. But the R.F.C. will not *sell* gold within the United States, under this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scheme. You cannot redeem your paper dollars at its offices. And it will buy in the domestic market only gold "newly mined in the United States." The quantity thus produced annually is small compared with the total stock. The price at which it is bought cannot have more than a psychological effect on the gold value of the money in this country—except that remote and uncertain effect which may come if a price is set high enough to encourage gold production and so to add slowly to the gold in bank reserves, thus facilitating expansion of credit.

The R.F.C. will also buy and sell gold in the world market. This affects directly the exchange value of the dollar in terms of foreign currencies. Great Britain has for some time carried on such operation with her exchange-equalization fund. Apparently it is this aspect of the matter which concerns the President chiefly, since he emphasizes the fact that "our dollar is now altogether too greatly influenced by the accidents of international trade, by the internal policies of other nations and by political disturbances in other continents."

What the effect of buying and selling abroad will be depends upon how it is done. By selling dollars in large quantities, the government can depress the gold value of the dollar abroad. It is sometimes argued that this is a good way to increase commodity prices at home. But the result does not necessarily follow. And action of this kind prompts foreign retaliation which eventually nullifies its effects in any case. A better way to use this device is to dampen down sudden and temporary aberrations from the course which dollar exchange would take under the normal influence of the balance of payments. If any foreign nation uses aggressive methods to defeat a normal price increase here by bidding up the dollar, we shall have a defense. If Great Britain and the United States can agree on a common monetary policy, they may be able to stabilize their relative exchanges without going back to a permanent gold standard at all. Perhaps this is what the President has in mind.

Will the new monetary device be sufficient to effectuate the President's price policy? Obviously not. Obviously he must release frozen bank deposits and increase the use of bank credit in business. He must bring about new investment in capital goods, stimulate employment by governmental spending on public works and elsewhere. He must also exercise a discriminating control over various classes of prices. The speech may satisfy the inflationists because it sounds a little like what they are talking about; it may even stimulate another speculative price rise like that which we had last spring. But in fact and in the long run it merely adds a supplementary bit of control. It may, if it is used wisely, aid the far more important actions which are calculated to affect prices and employment and farm purchasing power, but which have nothing to do with the gold value of money.

The Striking Farmers' Case

SOME MONTHS ago the more radical and aggressive elements among the Western farmers, led by the Farmers' Holiday Association, threatened a nationwide strike. In response to a plea of the new administration they delayed their protest to see what the New Deal would do for them. What has happened since has not allayed their discontent, and there is now a scattered strike, accompanied by a more widespread outcry against the government. Have they a just cause for complaint?

Ever since the War, prices of crops at the farm have been lower, relative to prices of things the farmers buy, than in 1913. Of course they have been much lower than in the boom agricultural year of 1919. In 1919, prices received by farmers were 109 percent above 1913, while prices paid by them were only 98 percent above. It was in the war years that much of the mortgage debt on farms was incurred. Then came the post-war depression. In 1921 the prices received by farmers had fallen to 16 percent above 1913, while the prices paid by them were still 49 percent above. The value of a unit of agricultural commodities in terms of a unit of the goods bought by farmers was only 78 percent of the pre-war level. A gradual narrowing of this spread occurred during the succeeding revival, until, in 1929, the purchasing power of crops was back to 92 percent. If one takes into account the increase in efficiency of the farm machinery bought for a given price, the farm purchasing power was in 1929 about the same as before the War. This was not so bad, although it compared unfavorably with the gain of 15 percent registered during the same period by the purchasing power of the per-capita earnings of manufacturing labor, and still more unfavorably with the enormous profits of business and speculation. Furthermore, the prices received by the farmers were only 60 percent as high as those received in the war boom years when they had done so much borrowing.

Then came real disaster. Crop prices went down like a diving hawk. While other prices fell, they fell much less. By February, 1933, the prices received for crops were only 49 percent of the 1913 level, and less than one-quarter as much as when the farmers were mortgaging themselves to extend their output for war purposes. On the same date the prices paid by farmers were exactly the same as before the War. Thus the index of farm purchasing power was 49 percent of 1913. This was the situation when Mr. Roosevelt took office.

Improvement began immediately. It was startlingly rapid. Prices received by farmers increased 2 percent betwen February and March, 6 percent March to April, 17 percent April to May, 3.2 percent May to June, and 18.8 percent June to July. Prices paid by farmers fell one percent from February to March, rose only one percent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in each of the next three months and went up 3.9 percent June to July. The result was that by July the prices received by farmers were 76 percent of 1913, the prices paid by them 106 percent of 1913, and the index of their purchasing power had risen from 49 to 72. This was a tremendous and sensationally rapid improvement, but the gap between the two classes of prices was still far from closed. And the debt burden still was crushing.

If this upward tendency had continued, even though at a slower rate, it is probable that the revolt would have been eroded away. But since July it has been reversed. Between July and August the prices received by farmers fell 5.3 percent, and between August and September they fell 2.8 percent. In the same two months the prices paid by farmers rose 4.7 percent and 3.6 percent. The purchasing power of a unit of farm products fell 9.9 percent and 6.3 percent. This left the farmers still 22.4 percent better off in September than in February, but only 61 percent as well off as in 1913. The farmers cannot truthfully say that they are not, on the average, in a better position than when President Roosevelt took office, but they can say that their position is still desperate, and has become steadily worse since the A.A.A. and the N.R.A. went into action.

It is obvious that a farm strike cannot in itself improve the farmers' situation. When the strike is on, the many who do not join derive any temporary benefit in prices which may arise from the withholding of crops from the market. When it is over, the fundamental factors which determine prices will operate as before.

We believe also that the principal remedies urged by the farm-strike leaders would be ineffective. Inflation or threatened inflation might be of temporary benefit through speculative increase of farm prices, as it was from March to July. But, the more rapid the speculative increase, the more certain is a reaction. The fall of farm prices since July is largely due to just such a rebound from oversanguine speculation for the rise. Some of the farm leaders demand arbitrary fixing of crop prices by the government. But, without a complete dictatorship, price fixing will fail unless it is based on effective adjustment between demand and supply.

As long as anything like a free market prevails, the only way to increase crop prices permanently is to decrease the output or increase the demand, or both. The first aim is the principal policy of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which the farm strikers denounce, and the second can be achieved only—if we discount the possibility of stimulating exports—by raising the purchasing power of the industrial population. This has at least been the avowed aim of the N.R.A., which the strikers also denounce. It has to some slight extent been achieved. The administration's recent move, through the Surplus Relief Corporation, to buy up agricultural surpluses and distribute them to the unemployed is one of the best conceivable ways to enlarge the demand and help maintain farm prices. If it had not been for these and other activities calculated to restrict output and enlarge demand, the farmers would undoubtedly be suffering today more than they do, and would have less hope for the future.

This is a valid defense of the administration so far as it goes, but it does not, and should not, allay the farmers' discontent. Much more vigorous action is necessary than has so far been taken, especially in the direction of increasing the purchasing power of city consumers. This involves both raising wage earnings more than they have been increased and keeping down the prices of industrial products at the same time. The farmers have a thoroughly justified objection to the N.R.A. for the omissions and commissions which allow manufacturers and distributors to increase prices almost without public control. They have a right to insist that far more drastic action be taken to relieve them of the overburden of mortgage debt. At present, whenever they seem about to become more prosperous, their creditors refuse to do anything except try to collect. The farmers have reason to blame the delay in starting the public-works program, which might have stimulated reëmployment. They have—although many of them do not understand it—a justifiable objection to a whole system based on private ownership of productive property and the seeking of private profit, unless President Roosevelt by some miracle can tame it and force it to increase mass purchasing power sufficiently and in a short enough time to rescue the tillers of the soil.

The Bear and the Eagle

NO ONE who follows the course of public events can have been surprised at the news that negotiations are under way looking toward the restoration of diplomatic relations with Russia. It has long been a wide open secret that Mr. Roosevelt intended to make this move. Since he is too shrewd, generally speaking, to risk the failure of such important negotiations, we may take it for granted that in private discussions which have already taken place, agreement has been reached on all the most fundamental issues. As so often happens, the passage of time has rendered negligible questions which once bulked large in the eyes of most people. The matter of paying the Tsarist and Kerensky debts and of compensating American owners of confiscated property no longer seems so important, since all our European debtors have repudiated, or are about to repudiate, the great majority of their debts, and since American private investments in every other part of the world have been so heavily depreciated.

Even more startling is the change of temper in regard to Russian-inspired Communist propaganda in this country. Except for a few professional

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

patriots of the die-hard school of Hamilton Fish, nobody seems much interested in the question any more. There are several reasons for this. One is that, as Leon Trotsky points out elsewhere in this issue, the Russians have themselves lost much of their old zeal for the world revolution. Another is that in view of the dismal failure of our own institutions during the past few years, we are probably far less cocksure regarding our invincible rightness, more willing to listen to alternative schemes. Again, the rise of Hitlerism in Germany has shown us that people may have a hydrophobic hatred of Communism and still be painfully undesirable. Still another reason is perhaps the fact that in fifteen years of Communist propaganda in this country, the Communists have only succeeded in rolling up a voting strength of between 100,000 and 200,000 out of an electorate of roughly 40 millions. At any rate, no one seems to doubt that an agreement on propaganda will be reached without much difficulty.

That The New Republic is pleased with President Roosevelt's action should go without saying. Ever since the U.S.S.R. came into existence, the editors of this paper have urged that full diplomatic recognition should be extended to it. They have always believed that the recognition policy of the past quarter of a century, which has sought to exercise a moral judgment on the character of a regime, has been unsound and unwise, inconsistent in practice and inadequate for its supposed purposes. Much better, in their judgment, is the historic American policy practised during our first hundred years, which promptly and automatically recognized any government in the world as soon as it came into existence and could offer reasonable proof that it did in fact rule the territory over which it claimed sovereignty. The United States and Russia are the two greatest countries in the world; there is every reason why their official relations should be at least as amicable as those between this country and France or Great Britian—to say nothing of Mussolini's Italy or Hitler's Germany.

While this is true, a realistic attitude requires a note of warning as to the immediate economic effects of recognition, which are being greatly overestimated in certain quarters. The Russians are sound economic determinists, and they will buy in the market which suits them best—namely, the market which produces the goods they want, which is willing to take their goods in exchange and, in the present period of emergency, to extend ample long-time credits. America has in the past sold to Russia on a scale of $115 million annually, and bought from her on a scale of $25 million, without diplomatic relations and at a time when countries which had recognized the U.S.S.R. enjoyed far smaller amounts of trade. We began, some months ago, to lend government money to Moscow for the purchase of our surplus agricultural products. No doubt recognition will facilitate doing this on an even greater scale; but for us to make huge loans to Russia for the purchase of our products is, from the long-time point of view, healthy neither for her nor for us, unless we are willing in the future to accept enough goods to pay the debt, without shipping goods in return. The elimination of our present absurd treasury regulations will do something to encourage our Russian imports, but probably not much—and especially when American producers of competing products begin to howl. The important thing to remember is that both Russia and the United States are now embarked upon policies looking toward greater national self-sufficiency. Russia in particular would like sometime to cut both imports and exports to an irreducible minimum, and her present variations from that policy are under the compulsion of events.

Much more important, of course, for the immediate future is the political effect of restored amity between these two countries. It was doubtless the situation in the Far East, quite as much as the desire to open up new markets for our goods, which caused Mr. Roosevelt to take the initiative with Comrade Kalinin. The new balance of power which Hitler has helped to create shows Germany and Japan in something of a tacit alliance against Russia, Great Britain and France and her allies. The United States now, so far as the Far East is concerned, throws more weight into the Russian side of the scale. This does not mean that we would participate actively in a war between Russia and Japan—at least, if the American government follows its present policy. It does mean, however, that Russia's position would be much better in the event of such a war. As a matter of fact we simply are abandoning a positively un-neutral position which favored Japan at the expense of the Soviet Union, though we are not in sympathy with Japan's activities. The prospect of recognition has already undoubtedly had a somewhat sobering influence on both Tokio and Berlin, and has thereby served to counterbalance somewhat the losses caused by the withdrawal of Japan and Germany from the League. To that extent, it makes for peace—something devoutly to be desired in the world of today.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1933, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Preventive War?

DISARMAMENT turns out to be a process hardly less dangerous than arming. No one has any firm belief that any convention, however meaningless, will emerge from the Geneva Conference. The quotations of armament shares are soaring in the market, for if there is no convention we shall face an early risk of war. It is hard to say what it is, in this atmosphere of alarm, that governments really fear. I find it hard to believe that they actually fear Hitler. His preparations, if he is arming secretly, must require several years more to mature, and even then the odds against him, while Poland and Russia fraternize, and the French system of alliances holds firm, would be overwhelming.

It is probable that what all the governments concerned really fear is the state of mind of their own citizens. Mr. MacDonald, with a pacifist past to live down, is at a heavy disadvantage in facing his Tory following. It is manifestly restive, for at the annual party conference this month, it adopted unanimously a resolution proposed by Lord Lloyd and Mr. Churchill, which expressed its alarm at the inadequacy of British armaments. Expenditure on "defense" rose this year by nearly $25 million, with prices at a level that means that armies and fleets have been buying much more with their money than before the slump. There will be pressure for a further acceleration of naval building, and above all for the construction of a bigger fleet of aircraft. The danger of this situation is that those who normally would stand four-square against this belligerent temper, the Liberals and Labor, are themselves of two minds—devoted to peace, they none the less pray for the destruction of the barbarous Nazi regime, somehow, anyhow. Clearly then it is not easy for Mr. MacDonald to disarm—if that were his wish—and still less is it easy for him to concede anything to Hitler. But if he will neither disarm, nor allow Germany to arm, it seems to follow that there can be no convention.

The French government, *mutatis mutandis,* is in exactly the same difficulty. M. Daladier also was a pacifist, and by French canons a genuine one. He may be riding for a fall over a very difficult budget, for he has felt already the coming storm, if he dares to reduce the French army to a short-term militia of 200,000 men—though, to be sure, the prudent man would retain a colonial force of equal size, largely composed of professional troops. On the other side of the frontier Hitler also has his difficulties. He has no electors to consider, but his Storm Troops may turn against the Leader. Some success, after all this marching and bravado, he must win, and win it in the foreign field. He had concentrated on the Austrian objective. It is too soon to say that he has been foiled there: one is not certain that even Mussolini's aid, the support of the banks of London and Paris and the blessings of the Church will avail to keep Mr. Dollfuss seated on his dictator's throne indefinitely, but it is possible. It follows that if Hitler cannot rush Austria before the winter is over, his withdrawal from Geneva must produce results at home. If he could parade a few forbidden tanks, and send up over Berlin a squadron of undisguised fighting airplanes, he might feel secure for some time to come. But dare he fail all round? Dare he achieve as little in the cause of equal rights as the unhappy Brüning, and much less than the liberals who preceded him?

So much Mussolini, who has got Vienna as his own perquisite, has understood: his prescription is "token" tanks and airplanes. But M. Daladier and Mr. MacDonald dare not understand it: what they grasp is the significance of M. Tardieu and Mr. Churchill.

The result is deadlock. London, which moves contentedly in tow to Paris, has agreed on the postponement of all disarmament for a further period of four years—though it might timidly suggest a slightly shorter term. During this moratorium Germany will be periodically searched for secret arms—an unpleasant and probably futile process, to which British dockyards, to the indignation of the navy, would also have to submit. By the end of this term the "defensive" armies of the Continent will be standardized—that is to say, each Great Power (including Poland) will have a home force of 200,000 men, plus a handsome allowance, on the right side, for colonial troops. This would be, during the four years, the only perceptible change, and one cannot call it disarmament, for it would increase the numbers of trained fighting men. Throughout this period, and for part of the four succeeding years, the victors would retain their advantage in heavy guns, heavy tanks and bombing airplanes, which would be scrapped only very gradually after 1937 or 1938.

The German case is difficult to answer. "Since you have decided that tanks, if they weigh no more than sixteen tons, are virtuous defensive weapons: since you have placed fighting (but not bombing) airplanes in the same category: since no one can call anti-aircraft guns and fortifications offensive, why are these things denied us? We waited patiently through fourteen years, while you forgot your promise to disarm. We have waited two more, while you debated at Geneva. We refuse to wait for a further four years. We do not ask even now for as many tanks and airplanes as the least of you possesses. But some we must have: it is a point of honor." Common sense inquires whether a com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promise is possible: shorten the period of delay, and cut down Germany's new arms to a few museum pieces. One cannot say that principle forbids: she is a stranger to Geneva. But common sense does not thrive in the atmosphere created by the Nazis.

The odds, then, are against the conclusion of any convention, though something may be drafted which a few powers will sign, and no one will ratify. Germany is not the only obstacle; Japan sits wisely silent, content that others should do the wrecking for her. The figures limiting her army were left discreetly blank in the British draft. They have yet to be filled in and accepted. The Japanese delegation has bluntly said that it will not consent to any inspection of its armaments. Will Japan then be exempted from inspection, or will she simply refuse to sign? But if she does not sign (or if she rejects inspection) Russia naturally will take the same course—of this she has given plain warning. But Russia has neighbors: they cannot be bound if she is loosed. And they in turn have neighbors. On this score then, apart altogether from the German difficulty, it seems doubtful whether a convention can be ratified.

What then? We are left as we were, with this difference, that the French declare that they have proof of Hitler's extensive violation of the Versailles Treaty by secret arming. Apart from this, it is possible, and indeed probable, that if Geneva fails to give him some plausible imitation of equality, he will tear up the Treaty and arm openly. Even the mild Dr. Brüning and the shrewd von Schleicher had threatened to do this. Can the fire-eating Nazis do less? But equally could any French government submit to such a defiance and survive? It seems, then, that Paris must at least propose some measures of coercion to enforce the Versailles Treaty. There are two possibilities. The thing might perhaps be attempted under the League's procedure, in which case a blockade or "non-intercourse" might be decreed against Germany. I confess that I do not see the legal steps at all clearly, but I have met Genevan experts who are confident that it could be done under the Covenant. But would Italy give her consent, which is requisite if the council is to act? I doubt it. She is bartering actively with Paris. She aims at hegemony in Central Europe, and this is a price which Paris and London seem prepared to pay. But I do not believe that Mussolini will risk a final and permanent breach, not merely with Hitler, but with the German nation. And that would happen, if he joined in the general coercion.

Failing League procedure, France must act under the Treaty of Versailles, with such allies as she can enlist. The Treaty, oddly enough, provides no "sanction" in plain terms for this offense, but the general expectation is that the Rhineland would be reoccupied, with the Ruhr in all probability included. Would Great Britain participate? It is too soon to say. Some Tories would do so with enthusiasm; Lord Hailsham, the Minister of War, has said so publicly. But there is another school of Tory thought, the Rothermere-Beaverbrook school, which would cut all our entanglements in Europe, in order to concentrate on the Empire. Labor, though with a divided mind, would also oppose, since it loves peace a little more than it hates the Nazis. On the whole, it is probable that Great Britain would not actively participate, but neither would it oppose. It would take refuge in an ambiguity for which the Prime Minister would find the suitable formula.

France, then, with Belgian, Polish and Czech support would be embarked in effect upon a preventive war. It could not be a bloodless occupation like the last. No party could prate about honor as the Nazis do, and then behave as tamely as the "Marxists" did. To resist would doubtless be suicide, but nations, to say nothing of parties, have done that before. It would be a cruel and ruthless struggle, and I suspect that its end would be a partition of Germany. Hitler, of course, would disappear as the Kaiser did, but that any satisfactory form of government could emerge in a ruined and divided Germany after a second defeat, I think unlikely. The French would see to it that there should be no social revolution. If anyone supposes that the German nation would emerge from this experience sobered, chastened and convinced of the purity of the Allies' motives, he entertains too high an opinion of German charity and too low an opinion of German intelligence. The simplest German is capable of understanding the motive that made the Treaty of Versailles, and the motive that may insist on its enforcement. It was not a disinterested love of peace.

This, then, is the horizon that confronts us after two years of disarming. It is a dangerous enterprise, if one goes about it with but moderate honesty. The ugliest aspect of our case is, perhaps, that if we have any hope of dodging catastrophe, it rests on Mussolini, the ablest but much the most sinister of Europe's statesmen.

H. N. Brailsford.

Granite

He was of ancient granite, held secure
In its high place. He was a composite
Of many-colored fields. Cattle-manure,
Field-violets and corn composed his wit,
Azurely bound by sky, brownly by earth.
No day combined more bounteous with a night
Than this man with a woman toward a birth.
Young granite should have come from him by right;
And yet instead there issued from his loins
The sons and daughters of some alien race,
Who would have plowed only to turn up coins
And who bred the very dollar in the face.
He shot his wife one day, loosed his own hold
And left his sons and daughters his small gold.

Witter Bynner.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia and World Revolution

NEWSPAPER dispatches indicate that Washington is preparing to recognize the Soviet government. It is safe to say that in the forthcoming discussion between President Roosevelt and M. Litvinov, the possible activities of the Comintern will play an important part. America is entering upon a period of profound social shifts. Under such circumstances, the intervention of the Comintern must appear especially dangerous. Moreover, among well known circles, even now it is considered an immutable fact that the recognition of the U.S.S.R. carries with it, in reality, the recognition of the Comintern. We are justified, in our opinion, in stating that such a view is a most vulgar anachronism, being held by people, especially professional politicians, who are loath to ponder new facts, particularly when the latter run counter to their prejudices.

From the first days of its existence, the Soviet government protested against attempts to identify it with the Comintern. Juridically, these protests were irreproachable, because, despite their community of ideals, the two organizations rested upon different national and international foundations; and in their activities they remained formally independent of each other. But the statesmen of Europe and America were not reassured by this legalistic distinction. They cited the factual connection between the Soviet government and the Third International. The same people were at the head of both organizations. Neither Lenin nor his closest collaborators hid or desired to hide their leading participation in the life of the Communist International. While the Soviet government of that period deemed it possible to make very great material sacrifices for the sake of preserving peaceful relations with capitalistic governments, Soviet diplomacy was under the strictest instruction not to enter into any discussions relating to the Communist International, to the location of its center in Moscow, to the participation of the leading members of the government in it, etc. In this sphere, concessions were considered even more impermissible than in the sphere of the fundamental principles of the Soviet regime, its system of government, the nationalization of the means of production, the monopoly of foreign trade, etc. When Chicherin, in a letter to Lenin, hinted at the advisability of making concessions to Wilson in reference to the suffrage laws of the Soviet republic, Lenin replied, by letter, with a counter-proposal that Chicherin be sent to a sanatorium for a while, in view of the obvious breakdown of his political balance. Nor is it difficult to conceive how Lenin would have replied had any Soviet diplomat been so bold as to suggest some concession or other to capitalist partners at the expense of the Comintern! So far as I recall, no one ever made any such proposals even in a masked form.

During the Brest-Litovsk negotiations, when he argued for the necessity of accepting the German ultimatum, Lenin reiterated time and again, "It is insanity to stake the conquests of the October revolution in an obviously hopeless war; if the salvation of the German revolution were concerned, that would be another matter. In that case, we would have to risk the fate of the Soviet republic, because the German revolution is incommensurably more important than our own." Fundamentally, the other leaders of the Soviet republic looked at the matter in the same way. In their own time, their speeches and articles were amply quoted as proof of the organic connection between the Soviet government and the Comintern. Therefore the conservative politicians of Europe and America failed to react to arguments *de jure;* they referred to the situation *de facto.*

However, much water has gone under the bridge since the time when the ideas of Lenin and his closest co-workers were the definitive ideas of the Soviet republic and the Comintern. Circumstances have changed, people have changed; the ruling stratum of the U.S.S.R. has been renovated completely; the old ideas and slogans have been ousted by new ones. What had formerly composed the essence has now become transformed into a harmless ritual. But instead, there remain preserved intentionally the convictions of some statesmen of the West, based on recollections, as to the indissoluble tie between the Soviet government and the Comintern. It is time this view was revised! In the present-day world, so torn by contradictions, there are far too many real bases for enmity to seek artificial reasons for fanning it. It is time to understand that despite the ritualistic phrases employed on holiday occasions, the Soviet government and the Comintern now inhabit different planes. Not only are the present leaders of the U.S.S.R. prepared to make no national sacrifices for the sake of the German and, in general, the world revolution, but also they do not hesitate for a moment to take such actions and make such pronouncements as deal the heaviest blows to the Comintern, and the workers' movements as a whole. The more the U.S.S.R. strengthens its international position, the deeper becomes the rift between the Soviet government and the international revolutionary struggle.

The most brilliant moments in the life of the Comintern were its congresses, unfailingly assembled in Moscow. Here, through the exchange of international experience and the clash between

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

various tendencies, were formulated the basic programmatic viewpoints and the tactical methods. The definitive participation of the Soviet leaders in the policies of the Comintern was displayed most convincingly precisely during these congresses. Lenin opened and closed the first congress of the Comintern. He delivered the most important reports at the second congress. At the third congress he headed the struggle against the erroneous policies of Zinoviev, Bela Kun and others. Hardly recovered from the first attack of his illness, Lenin read the report of the new economic policy of the Soviets at the fourth congress. His mind was as lucid as ever, but at times his blood vessels failed him, and he paused in anguish. . . . To complete the picture it might be permissible to add that the programmatic manifestoes of the first two congresses were written by the author of these lines, and that the reporter on the basic tactical questions at the third and fourth congresses was the People's Commissar of Army and Navy.

It is necessary to add to what has been said above that in those days the congresses of the Comintern were convoked every year. During the first four years of the existence of the Third International (1919-1922), there took place four congresses. But that was the epoch of Lenin. Since the fourth congress, eleven years have elapsed. During this entire period, only two congresses have taken place, one in 1924, the other in 1928. It is five and a half years now since the congresses of the Comintern have been last convoked. This bare chronological summary serves better than any other discussion to throw light upon the actual state of affairs. During the years of civil war, when the Soviet republic was surrounded on all sides by the barbed wire of blockade, and when a trip to the Soviet Union involved not only difficulties but mortal dangers, the Congresses convened yearly. During recent years, when trips to the U.S.S.R. have become utterly prosaic matters, the Comintern has been obliged to refrain from congresses altogether. In their stead have come the intimate conferences of the bureaucratic tops which are bereft of even a shade of the meaning that was implicit in the multitudinous and democratically elected congresses. But even in these closed sessions of functionaries, not one of the responsible leaders of the Soviet Union any longer participates. The Kremlin is interested in the work of the Comintern only so far as is necessary to shield the interests of the U.S.S.R. from any kind of compromising action or pronouncement. The matter no longer touches the juridical limitation of functions, but a political rupture.

This same ideological course can be very convincingly followed through in the evolution of the foreign policy of the Comintern. We shall confine ourselves to counterposing the original moment of the Soviet diplomacy with the present day. Lenin called the Brest-Litovsk peace a "breather," *i. e.*, a brief pause in the struggle between the Soviet state and world imperialism. In this struggle, the Red Army was officially and openly avowed to be the same weapon as was the Communist International. The present foreign policy of the Soviet Union has nothing in common with these principles. The supreme achievement of Soviet diplomacy is the Geneva formula which provides the definition of aggression and of the aggressor nation, a formula which applies not only to the interrelations between the Soviet Union and its neighbors, but also to the interrelations between the capitalist states themselves. In this manner, the Soviet government has assumed officially the duty of safeguarding the political map of Europe, as it has emerged from the Versailles laboratory. Lenin considered that the historical character of a war is determined by those social forces which oppose each other on the battlefield and by the political goals they pursue. The present Soviet diplomacy springs completely from the conservative principle of maintaining the status quo. Its attitude toward war and the warring sides is determined not by a revolutionary criterion, but by the legalistic criterion: which one crosses the foreign boundaries first. Thus the Soviet formula sanctions the defense of national territory against aggression for capitalist nations as well. We shall not discuss how good or bad this is. In general, the purpose of this article is not to criticize the policies of the present Kremlin, but to show the profoundly altered principles of the entire international orientation of the Soviet government, in order thus to eliminate those fictitious barriers which are in the way of the recognition of the U.S.S.R.

The plan for building socialism in one country alone is in no wise an empty phrase; it is a practical program, embracing in equal degrees economy, internal policies and diplomacy. The more decisively the Soviet bureaucracy has intrenched itself in its position as to national socialism, the more the questions of international revolution, and with them the Comintern, have been relegated to the background. Every new revolution is an equation with many unknowns, and hence it includes in itself an element of major political risk. The present Soviet government seeks, with might and main, to ensure its internal security against risk connected not only with wars but revolutions. Its international policies have been transformed from international-revolutionary policies into those which are conservative.

True, the Soviet leadership cannot openly avow the facts as they are, either to its own workers or those of other countries. It is shackled by the ideological heritage of the October revolution, which forms the reservoir for its authority with the working masses. But while the shell of the tradition remains, the content has evaporated. The Soviet government allows the rudimentary organs of the Comintern to maintain their residence in Moscow. But it no longer permits them to convoke international congresses. Since it no longer counts upon the assistance of foreign Communist parties, it no longer concerns itself in the least with their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests in its own foreign policies. We need only refer to the nature of the reception accorded to the French politicians in Moscow in order to be hit between the eyes by the contradiction between the epoch of Stalin and the epoch of Lenin!

A recent issue of the French official organ, Le Temps (September 24), carries a dispatch from Moscow which is most significant. "The platonic hopes for the world revolution are being expressed [among the ruling circles of the U.S.S.R.] all the more fervently, the more they are being renounced in practice." Le Temps goes on to elucidate, "Since the removal of Trotsky, who with his theory of the permanent revolution represented a genuine international danger, the Soviet rulers, headed by Stalin, have adhered to the policy of building socialism in one country without awaiting the problematic revolution in the rest of the world." The newspaper insistently warns against error those French politicians who still incline to confuse the phantoms of the past with the realities of today. Let us not forget that this involves, not a chance publication but the most influential and utterly conservative organ of the ruling class of France. Jaurès once said aptly about Le Temps, "It is the bourgeoisie turned into a newspaper."

Of all the world governments, the American government has up to now adhered most irreconcilably, in relation to the Soviets, to the principle of capitalistic "legitimacy." In this, the question of the Comintern played the decisive role; we need only recall the Hamilton Fish committee! However, if the honorable member of Congress keeps in touch with living facts, which need no testimony of witnesses—for they speak for themselves—he must come to the conclusion that the foreign policy of the Soviet government no longer creates the slightest hindrance toward its recognition, not only *de facto* but *de jure*.

LEON TROTSKY.

George Record

THERE have been written few more fascinating books, disclosing an inside view of American politics, than James Kerney's "The Political Education of Woodrow Wilson." Much of it consists in an account of how George Record made a liberal out of a confirmed conservative, and drafted and carried through the Jersey legislature, while Wilson was Governor, the series of bills that gained Wilson the attention of the country and put him on the road to the presidency.

In 1931, after reading and liking this book, Lincoln Steffens, a close friend of Record's, wrote to Kerney:

> But the idea you left me biggest with is "The Record of George L. Record." As I learned from you the part this amazing man played in the education of Mr. Wilson, I recalled his efforts to show me and Mark Fagan and Everett Colby, and all that crowd and others, many others, what they were up against, really, and what to do about it. He must have played a part in the lives and education of more men than anybody except perhaps his opposite, Alexander Hamilton. He has been the Thomas Jefferson of our day. His story should be told. It should not be left scattered and buried here and there in other men's lives. He should come out himself in the open, as a person, as a character, as a statesman. Indeed, his letters, etc., might in his case be the best part of a book about Record. For, you see, what he has said to the various leaders is what we all want to have said to the people, all of them. . . . The man himself will appear in his writings, but the editor will have to tell enough of the history, circumstances and characteristics back of the letters, to bring out the sweetness, patience and tact of one of the most courageous, continuous and unselfish leaders that democracy has ever had. And I mean "ever" in all history. Anyhow, it's your bully book on Wilson that advertises the need of a book, a big book, on George L. Record to me. Do think it over.

Record's social philosophy was, in its main tenet, the same as that of the late William G. Sumner of Yale. Like Sumner, he based his thinking on the principle, not of equality, but of the equal chance. From this Jeffersonian philosophy, and out of his own experience as a factory hand in Maine, a stenographer and law student in the office of John Cadwalader in New York, and, finally, an immensely able lawyer, he built both his analysis of American life and his political program.

Record was a confirmed individualist—the most intellectually satisfying I have ever known. Yet his individualism, and here he differed radically from Sumner, never accepted the laissez-faire doctrine. He believed that the government should intervene in order to assure equal opportunity. He believed that this country would eventually have to make large but clearly limited concessions to state socialism. But these concessions are devised, first, in order to escape socialism itself, in which he had no faith; and second, as a means of preserving, or rather restoring, free competitive industrial conditions in the large fields of industry, where he was convinced the government should never enter.

Briefly sketched, Record's program is as follows:

The true function of government in relation to economic life is a constructive, not a restrictive one. It is to provide and protect an economic order in which invention, organization, mass production, modern methods of farming and all technical ad-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vance, will be used fully and without limitation for the creation of wealth and a steadily rising standard of living. No restrictive philosophy or program will justify itself in the long run. None can or should satisfy us unless its plain purpose is to assure to the consumer, to labor and capital, the full benefit of every advance in the methods of production and distribution, in short, of the machine age. When the government intervenes, it should be only to assure the free use of capital, the full volume of production, the free flow of necessaries and luxuries to the public, and, above all, the maximum employment of labor at a wage of increasing purchasing power. No plan that reduces production and diminishes the consumption of goods should be tolerable to intelligent men.

Record believed that the wants of the public and its consuming power, and the demand for labor, are literally limitless. But they are limitless only provided the restrictive principle of monopoly is abolished, and thereby prevented from raising prices and cutting down the consumers' power to buy and use. His observation through his long experience with business, big and small, convinced him that, if society were ordered with moderate intelligence, and the blight of monopoly removed, there would be no such thing as overproduction, or idle capital, or a labor surplus.

Record understood, perhaps more clearly than any other man of his time, the technique by which a strong business group in an industry drives out the equal chance and builds up the restrictive monopoly power. He saw and explained with extraordinary clarity the process by which the monopoly groups destroy competition, kite prices, reduce employment and wages, and thereby exhaust the purchasing power of the consumer, finally causing that industrial stagnation which periodically reaches its climax in depressions. He also saw—and here again he made a valuable contribution—that in every great industrial field where the monopoly principle is at work, the dominant monopoly group gains its power to kill competition and fix prices, never through efficiency, for monopoly is proverbially inefficient, and never through mere size (here he differed with Brandeis), but always by its possession or control of some essential industrial advantage, illegal or otherwise, which producers outside of the dominant group do not possess. Taking the steel industry as an example, he noted that the Steel Corporation has feudalized the industry and controlled prices. It has been able to do this, first, because it owns the ore-hauling roads which give it a transportation advantage over the independents, and second, because it owns or controls the principal high-grade ore deposits. In addition, he saw that, since the railroads which buy the trust's products are, for the most part, in the same hands as the trust, the Steel Corporation has the further and cardinal advantage of a better market for its goods.

Record saw that, if the government were to take over and operate the railroad system, this would remove the trust's advantage in the transportation of raw materials and fuel, as well as cancel its further advantage in control of customers. In addition, if the ore supply were acquired by the government through condemnation proceedings, and made available to all producers on equal terms, upon the payment of a royalty, the oppressive power of the trust would be more completely destroyed. Competition would return, the price of products would fall. And there would follow a vast increase in the use of steel, accompanied by a corresponding rise in the demand for labor.

Record found that, in almost every basic industry (coal, oil, beef-packing, aluminum, lumber, mines, milling, etc.) a privileged group, in normal times, controls the entire trade, prevents competition and fixes prices through the possession of unfair advantages, which are generally illegal under anti-trust laws and state constitutions, and always used for anti-social purposes. He saw that the real way to fight monopoly and high prices and the industrial stagnation that follows in their train, is not by dismembering the trusts, or by trying to regulate them —as that is impossible—but by separating them definitely from those particular things which give them their special advantage and power over the independents. That is why he advocated government ownership of the agencies of transportation and of the natural resources which the trusts own or control.

Finally, he saw—and this is one of the most important steps in his analysis—that the men who preside over monopolistic industry are literally forced to engage in publicity campaigns on a large scale, forced to go into politics and control the agencies of government, since only by this means can they protect their special advantages or privileges from successful attack by the government, or in the courts. He pointed out that, whereas the election of a President or an Attorney General or a Senator or the appointment of a Supreme Court Justice is a matter of tremendous consequence to Mr. Myron Taylor or Mr. Rockefeller or Mr. Mellon, it is of no consequence at all to Mr. Ford or Mr. Filene. For the business of Mr. Ford or Mr. Filene is not monopolistic, not sustained by any illegal or quasi-illegal privilege, and therefore is not in danger of attack.

So when Record made government ownership and operation of railroads, pipe lines, freight terminals, etc., cardinal planks in his political program, and when he added government ownership of the natural resources which the trusts monopolize and withhold from independent industry, he did this not as a step toward socialism. On the contrary, it was a step toward the restoration of individualism, to be expressed in fuller economic opportunity, production, consumption, and employment of labor. Also, it was a step in the direction of freeing the government from the constant corrupting influence of monopolists who, in order to carry on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

technique of monopoly, which is illegal, must dominate the agencies of government.

On the other hand, Record showed that in industries such as the automobile industry, the department and chain-store industries, where, as it happens, no group has been able to corral or control any essential element of production or distribution, there is no monopoly. Individualism flourishes. And the result is startling efficiency, low prices to the consumer and, outside of depression periods, large employment of labor at good wages. Record believed that it is not individualism which has been the destructive element in American business, in labor and in the budget of the consumer, but the so-called and false individualism of big business, which is not individualism at all, but its antithesis, monopoly.

Record distrusted socialism. He believed its philosophy to be basically unsound, its practice unworkable. He saw, as its chief and fatal weakness, the difficulty, indeed impossibility, of obtaining government administrators with sufficient knowledge, experience and honesty to conduct or regulate the vast field of production and distribution. He believed that the government would fail miserably the moment it tried to shelve the law of supply and demand and decree prices and wage scales. On the other hand, his experience and his constant examination of the reports of congressional investigations told him that, under the so-called but false individualism of big business, the chief disadvantages of socialism actually are present. For industry, as conducted by the Morgan, Rockefeller and Mellon groups, has done precisely what socialism would do! It has destroyed competition and private initiative. It has fixed prices. It has done these things, not as the socialists would—in the interest of the community—but for the benefit of a comparatively small number of people.

Record carried his philosophy of freeing opportunity into the land question, indeed into all political questions. He believed that people could be coaxed onto the millions of acres of fertile land that lie idle, if the government would give them assistance and instruction in making their living, as the Danish government has done. He did not concede that people would rather live in city slums than on farms. He considered the problem one of education and intelligent administration. He believed that the power of taxation should be invoked to make idle land available for the use of idle people or people who want to live by farming.

Record conducted three campaigns for the United States senatorship. In none of these was he, I think, in any real sense seeking office. He used his campaigns as a means of publishing his program and making people think realistically. He had confidence in his program because it grew out of his own contact with life. I campaigned with Record in two of his senatorial campaigns. His speeches were the ablest, most brilliantly argued political addresses I have listened to. I have heard many of the foremost political speakers of our time—Wilson, Brandeis, Borah, La Follette and lesser men. Not one of them I think could match Record in forceful, clear exposition of a subject. His native common sense, his honesty and utter fearlessness, his picturesque idiomatic expression and command of facts, placed him, so far as my knowledge of political arguments extends, in a class by himself.

Record made few compromises. He was no opportunist, never promised quick results; believed that no short cuts can be found to fundamental reform. He was always for the big play or nothing. I have good reason to believe that at various times during the last twenty years he could have gone to the United States Senate if he had been willing privately to signify an intention to take a "suave" course. In a sense, he belonged to the golden age of American politics, which formed its tradition in the first decades of the republic, to the time when men cared passionately for ideas and believed in their power and practical bearing upon a nation's life. He knew something about the lives of poor people. He had been poor himself. Both his hands had been broken and disfigured in a factory. He was very tolerant, impatient only with loose, muddy thinking and statement. His own mind worked with extraordinary power and precision. He liked to reduce to writing any proposal brought to him. He liked to put it in words so exactly chosen as to include the desired implications and no others. He used to say, "Let's get it down on paper; let's get it tight as if we were drawing a bill." He was resourceful and always humorous. No one in the room could listen to anyone else while Record talked. He was unselfish. He had an unflagging desire to do good. He was one of the few men I ever knew who spent his life saying and doing precisely what he believed in. He was a devoted friend, and I think the only really great man I have known.

AMOS PINCHOT.

The Ancestors

(After J. P. B.)

When the night's coming and the last light falls
A weak child among lost shadows of the floor,
It is your listening; pulse heeds the strain
Of fore and after. Wind shivers the door:
What masterful delay commands the blood
Breaking its access to the living heart?
Consider this, the moment's indecision,
Not yours but held systaltic to the flood
Of ancient failure begging its new start:
The instant pause between the day and night
(When the heart knows its informality)
The bones hear but the eyes will never see—
Punctilious abyss, the yawn of time
Come once a day to suffocate the sight.
There is no man on earth who can be free
Of this, the eldest in the latest crime.

ALLEN TATE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Whipsawing the Farmer—N.R.A. versus A.A.A.—Price Fixing and Mark-ups—Our Serene President

IT IS becoming more and more clear that when Congress convenes two months from now, the farming interests, through their representatives in House and Senate, will strenuously protest against the condition in which the recovery program has left them. The fact is that the situation has reached a point where some sort of action by the administration will probably be taken within the next week or so. The distress of the farmer caused by the continued disparity between the price of what he has to sell and the price of what he has to buy has become increasingly acute during recent weeks.

I have previously mentioned the clash between the National Recovery Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration over the policy pursued by the former. The argument of the A.A.A. is that the pressure to raise prices of manufactured products is so intense that these prices have gone up to a point where the spread between them and agricultural prices leaves the farmer as badly off as ever. The recent drop of ten cents a bushel in the price of wheat, together with a slightly less steep drop in the price of cotton, has brought farm prices to a point where the disparity between them and the industrial prices is almost as great as it was last March, when efforts to raise farm prices were first begun.

This, in the opinion of the statistical experts of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, creates a bad situation which will soon become intolerable. Certainly the farmers consider it intolerable, and are pointing out through their spokesmen that no matter what happens to bring them more money, something always happens to take it away faster than it comes in. In this point, at least, there is a general agreement that the overhaste of the N.R.A. to raise industrial prices is the main reason for the trouble.

It has been well known for a long time that General Johnson of the N.R.A. and Mr. George Peek of the A.A.A. did not see eye to eye, and that they have had more than one rather stormy exchange of views on the subject. The still low prices of farm products and the continued spread between them and the prices of other commodities is the reason for the very emphatic opposition of the A.A.A. to the price-fixing provisions of the master code for the food and grocery industry and also to the similar provisions in the general retail code which has been before the N.R.A. for weeks. To some features of this code, as I have pointed out, the Consumers' Advisory Board of the N.R.A. is itself opposed.

A few days ago a conference on this whole subject was held by General Johnson, Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace and Director Peek. The nature and length of the conference were construed in Washington as indicating that General Johnson is preserving an open mind and is willing to give consideration to the objections raised before approving the mark-up features of the proposed code. The attitude of the A.A.A. is understood to be that if this mark-up of prices generally proves beneficial for retailers and wholesalers, it will also be beneficial for farmers. However, the A.A.A. has no actual price-fixing plans. It is convinced that the mark-up feature of both codes would not help the farmer.

While no announcement came out of the latest conference, I am informed that in the end it was the consensus of opinion that a fixed mark-up for the entire country was not a feasible proposition. The decision seems to have been to hold up both the master code for the food and grocery business and the general retail code until a substitute can be worked out. The discouraging thing is that no one seems to have a clear idea as to the substitute. In the meantime, many retailers are marking up prices in advance of the code and just on general principles. There is no way in which the farmer can keep pace with this and his dissatisfaction is rapidly finding expression.

Of course, seven months is too short a period for a fair administrative trial and it may be that a way out of the difficulties will easily be found within another year. None the less, the hoped-for benefits of the act have not materialized, the farmers are unhappy and there will be many in Congress to recall those trenchant words of Mr. Roosevelt on March 17 last, when, in speaking of the Agricultural Act, he said, "I tell you frankly that it is a new and untrod path . . . if a fair administrative trial does not produce the hoped-for results, I shall be the first to acknowledge it and advise you!"

No one can maintain that the hoped-for results have as yet been achieved. On the contrary, the most ardent advocates are saying every day that they have not. This does not, I hasten to say, mean that they have lost faith in the scheme. It merely means that they feel that its successful working out has been temporarily blocked by the lack of coöperation in other directions. It is, I suppose, one of the difficulties that was to have been expected, but it is certainly giving the more thoughtful and responsible New Dealers considerable concern. Its failure, moreover, is one of the reasons for the inflation sentiment among the farmers —one of the reasons the President may be forced further toward inflation than he now wants or intends to go.

As they wrestle with these and other problems, including those now pressing on the State Department as a result of the Germans' resignation from the League and the exceedingly acute Cuban situation, the responsible heads of the various departments here are visibly worried. Some of them, as I said last week, show the strain under which they labor and there is a generally tense atmosphere as they bend every effort to advance in the battle against the depression, simultaneously conducted on so many fronts.

It is entirely natural that this should be so, but it is interesting, I think, that it does not seem to affect the President. He is reported to be in robust health and good spirits. No signs of care are visible to his many visitors or at the press conferences. He is amiable, urbane and apparently untroubled. He appears to have a singularly fortunate faculty for not becoming flustered. Those who talk with him informally in the evenings report that he busies himself with his stamp collection, discussing in an illuminating fashion the affairs of state while he waves his shears in the air.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Altogether, it seems to be the fact that Mr. Roosevelt, so far from being appalled or oppressed by the difficulties encountered, or by the prospect of Congress again on his hands, is convinced that as great progress as could be expected has been made the last six months, that the program is working excellently, that he has the situation well in hand and that the outlook is good. His is a peculiarly happy disposition, and this is a great boon for a man in his position.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Hamstringing the Securities Act—Subsidiary Corporations—Congressional Thunderclouds—Dillon, Read and Its Magic Carpet

NO LOUDER blast of publicity has been released in the newspapers for any cause since the now infamous Mellon tax laws than that which is working today toward a modification of the Securities Act. That Act was passed to protect the public from the depredations of those unscrupulous bankers who passed off on the American people the kind of paper which has been described in the recent Senate investigation of Dillon, Read and Company and Chase Securities Corporation. From some central source this propaganda is coming in an endless stream. In every newspaper every day, and often in two or three or more spots in the paper, the crusaders manage to plant their little and big bombs.

One argument is advanced for this—the Securities Act is holding up President Roosevelt's recovery program. Nothing can go forward until the capital-goods industries are revived and these can never be revived so long as the present Securities Act prevents corporation executives and investment bankers from floating new capital issues.

This argument can be supported only when those who make it come forward with actual instances of corporations that wish to float new capital issues and refrain from doing so because of the Act. They must show also that the issues proposed, which, incidentally, are being held back, would really go into productive investment and not merely to refinance operations to pay old debts. They must show that they are issues which sound economics justify. All these are matters of fact and up to now no facts have been produced. We have been asked to accept the mere word of men whose records justify us in mistrusting everything they say.

I called up a lawyer prominent in the movement to modify this act and asked him to give me some instances of new issues held up. He declared that he could give me fifty, but that the cases came to him as a lawyer and he could not disclose the facts. We are asked to take the word of a lawyer who has fifty clients who want this act repealed or modified. He did, however, suggest one case. A corporation had a lease on a building which was imperiled by the insolvency of the owner of the building, foreclosure on the mortgage standing against it and consequent cancellation of the lease. The corporation was willing to buy in the building, but wanted to do so by organizing another corporation—one of those countless satellite concerns —which would hold title to the building. To do so, however, it would have to supply a lot of data under the Securities Act about its own business in countless branches all over the country. This would take time and would be expensive. So it abandoned the plan. It would be interesting to know how the capital-goods market suffered in any way from a failure to float this little issue. Thus when you get down to brass tacks, the argument against the Act melts away.

In this case the result seems to me to be quite wholesome. The corporation's practice of organizing another subsidiary corporation every time it wished to add another function to its business has led to the worst abuses in our economic life. If this Act will discourage that kind of thing, it will serve a useful purpose. If a corporation wants to buy a building, why can it not do so directly, openly, frankly, just as can any citizen who is in business? Why must the corporation always be putting things in its wife's name? Is the government, after all we have witnessed, to be asked to change its laws to enable corporations to extend and complicate a little more the practice of distributing title to its assets around the map into endless clusters of corporations?

This lawyer suggested another case—the American Metals Company. This company has a bond issue falling due this year. It amounts to $15,935,000. Several reasons are offered why the company could not put out an issue of bonds to pay off this old bond issue. One of them is that bankers were unwilling to assume the liabilities imposed by the Act. Others applied to the corporation. But here again, what has such a bond issue to do with the subject of new capital goods? The money is not to be raised in order to erect new buildings or buy new equipment. It is to meet a note issued four years ago, to pay an old debt. And the money it has actually raised through a bank. I would like to see a single corporation which wants to raise money to erect new plants, install new equipment, create new capital goods, prevented from doing so by this Act.

In Washington, when I was there last week, I got the impression that the President looks with marked disfavor on any attempt to tinker with the Securities Act. Like Hoover, the President is probably becoming increasingly irritated at the performances of speculators in both grain and security markets. Their playfulness contributes in no way to a benevolent mood on the part of the White House toward what the general term of Wall Street implies. What is more, those who seek changes in this Act are reckoning without Congress. Congress has been more or less forgotten these last few months. But it will return to Washington in January. When it does, unless all signs fail, the country is going to see a thoroughly angry, thoroughly resolute group of legislators who will be in no temper to treat Wall Street gently.

One dainty morsel in the Dillon, Read story unfolded by Mr. Pecora in the Senate Banking Committee investigation was more or less obscured. Mr. Dillon's firm loaned something like $12 million to a South American city. The loan was chiefly to level a large hill by washing it into the bay. Dillon insisted that the engineering contract be let to a responsible company—of course "to protect the investors." So it was let to the Kennedy Company. The ostensible

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presiding genius here was Mr. Leonard Kennedy. But the company actually belonged to another corporation, called the Nassau Corporation, and this one belonged to Mr. Dillon's immediate family. The Kennedy Company was not an engineering concern at all. Now here is the lost morsel. Sometime before this, Dillon reorganized the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company. When this was done, Dillon declared that the job was too big for just an ordinary executive. It needed a great management concern. So the Goodyear Company, instead of electing a president and treasurer at say $50,000 or $100,000 for the president and $15,000 for the secretary, turned over the management of this giant rubber concern to a management company—the Kennedy Company—for a management fee of $250,000 a year. Then the management company named a president for Goodyear and paid him $50,000 a year. The Kennedy Company was also to get a bonus, and its compensation the first year amounted to over $900,000. It was ended when a stockholder's suit revealed the facts. This was the same Kennedy Company which belonged to Dillon's immediate family and which was at one moment "a great management company" to run the rubber business and at another a great engineering concern. But always Mr. Dillon was on the receiving end of the profits.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

Poetry of Defense

THREE numbers back in The New Republic, Mr. Horace Gregory published an essay, "A Defense of Poetry," and, via Shelley, traveled on to certain matters closer home. His central theme was Shelley's relevance to our times and the fact that "some kind of definite social conflict is now reawakened in poetry and that this is the very hour to reconsider Shelley with more than casual appreciation." Which means essentially that Shelley's example will help our poets to be aware of the world around us; that this awareness may give them a stronger sense of being involved in life, and may grant them out of life a stronger stir and semination.

Naturally I can agree on that. Nobody, save perhaps certain babblers about art for art's sake, who never get said what they quite mean, ever denied that art needs life and life needs art. The point, therefore, holds good for Shelley, and much more than ordinarily good, since Shelley's nature threw him hard upon his times. "Shelley's value to us today lies in his courage, his willingness to use his brains and learning toward the poetic realization of his moral convictions." Though I might prefer to say "toward the effort to create poetic forms that would contain his moral essence, so to speak," I do indeed agree here also with Mr. Gregory. I am wholly prepared, even, to agree with him to the extent of saying that if all our poets cut loose on the life around them, each in his own way, of course; if they were as "revolutionary," in Mr. Gregory's sense, as you like; if they blazed away for causes, policies, world peace, masses, wrongs, rights and so on, it would be a good thing. This would not necessarily make them poets, not in every case, nor any poet a poet always. But it might be, from his commotion, intense concern and the mere fact of having an object to go for, that a certain perfection of image would float across the poet's mind and get created, and thus stand a poem, complete in itself, which is the first necessity in any work of art. There is no more reason why to one great poet the Veterans' march on Mr. Hoover's Washington should not bring into existence a great poem than that, to another great poet, a marriage in sight for him should do the same and give us Spenser's "Prothalamion." And as to a rotten poem, I myself at least prefer one about the Kentucky coal strikers to one about roasting apples. If I were an apple I might feel differently, but since I am not and since the two poems are equally futile, I prefer the strike poem in the hope that with it the subject matter *per se* may distract me from the poet's ineffectuality.

So far, so good. But Mr. Gregory's development—and shall we say personal and esthetic applications?—of this thesis of his might be described as quite another matter. It is some of these points in the essay that I want to take up.

"Writing of Shelley," the essay begins, "in this hour is an act of separating Romantic legend and decadence from intelligence and truth." This might or might not be a platitude, according to what the words may mean; but, "By this," the writer, somewhat mysteriously, adds, "I mean that all great poetry springs from a central purpose, a purpose that Shelley found in Godwin's 'Political Justice,' in Sophocles' 'Prometheus,' in Milton's 'Paradise Lost,' in Plato's 'Symposium,' in Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' and 'Macbeth.'" Does this intend to say that Shelley found his own central purpose in these men, or that in each of them he found a central purpose? (In the latter case Godwin is to stand for a great poet.) As to finding a "Prometheus" by Sophocles, the mere discovery of such a text would be enough to make either Shelley or Mr. Gregory immortal, without bothering with the central-purpose motif. Nor is this a mere picking a writer up on information or on a mere slip: Aeschylus' mentality and spirit, in the choruses especially, were infinitely nearer to Shelley than Sophocles could be, even though there was a Sophocles volume in his pocket when they found his body. "For him [Shelley]," the article goes on, "intelligence and truth meant the fusion of moral laws, laws which controlled man's relationship to society as well as the flowering of his individual spirit. In a final sense, this synthesis which creates poetry (for he said 'The distinction between poets and prose writers is a vulgar error') is always revolutionary, as revolutionary as Galileo's discoveries, as Tom Paine's 'Rights of Man,' as Einstein's new physics, as Karl Marx's 'Das Kapital.'"

That is a more complicated argument. It is important here because Mr. Gregory relies heavily on it in the later campaign of his essay, where he says: "We must rediscover his relevance for our time, for in his poetry and in his ideas lies the strength of modern heresy, which is a defense of poetry at its source, which in turn is revolutionary by definition." It may be, or may not, that Mr. Gregory, by citing such names as Galileo and the others, means only a comparison to express the extent to which poetry is "always revolutionary"; but the fact remains that my interpretation, presently, of his meaning of "revolutionary" is entirely confirmed by the use he makes of the word later on in his attack.

To begin with, Plato—these are the words of Shelley's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own beautiful translation—speaks of poetry as "the cause whereby anything proceeds from that which is not, into that which is."

This means creation, life-essence finding a body, or form, new, whole, inseparable from it except it die, by which it is expressed, and in which it exists. Christ said he came that we might have life and have it more abundantly. The process by which the life-essence finds its form and is thereby alive implies the struggle between the two forces ever working, one that seeks to achieve form, one that seeks to break it down. This theme is a chestnut, see Pirandello, for example. Every quality, moment of experience, moral issue, every vital reality for you, consists in the drama of choice between forms. There is the old form that is dead, once expressive but no longer either embodying its previous content or expressive of the content waiting to find a body. There is the form that will embody this waiting content. In an exact parallel, though chemically, crystallization, by which in the midst of a solution a certain substance achieves its due form, is revolutionary. In this sense poetry, with its purpose of life more abundant, by breaking down forms grown empty of content, by finding itself in living forms, is "always revolutionary."

Spenser said, "For soul is form and doth the body make." And for an instance, in Dante's unique and incredible, if unequal, poem, "The Divine Comedy," it is the form (which, obviously, consists in the conceptions as well as in prosody, style and the total design) in which the life-essence is embodied and exists; it is, to repeat, the form that is the basis of the poem's depth. This poem is revolutionary by such creation of life as will change what is dead in us into what is quick. By quickening the life in us it challenges all forms, in every aspect of our living, that we have accumulated or have accepted. Dante's poetry was great not because it was concerned so often with the causes and theories and so on around him among men—which often enough loaded him with matter he could not transmute into poetry—his poetry was great because it created a body, whole in itself, that illumined and reënforced the humanity, causes and theories around him.

But when Mr. Gregory, as he does in the essay, cites, in connection with "revolutionary," only such instances as Galileo, Paine, Einstein, Marx, he fumbles the whole point. It is as absurd as saying that the only poetry in Galileo's life experience was the fact of his upsetting certain current dogmatic notions about the cosmos. And with regard to communism, poetry, *as poetry,* can be precisely as revolutionary as it is toward capitalism: everything depends, and entirely depends, on which of the two has sunk into more degrees of deadness. Simonides, in one of the great world poems—the poem with the Marathon dead asking the traveler to tell the Spartans that "we lie here obeying their orders," a poem hopelessly untranslatable into English—

> Ὦ ξεῖν', ἄγγειλον Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε
> κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι

is revolutionary in the profoundest sense applicable to poetry. He gives to the citizens the challenging glory of their heroes.

The "synthesis that Shelley defined as poetry is an eternal celebration of the human spirit as opposed to the celebration of ritual, the obscene act of worship before an empty altar." Taking the words as meaning this, that or the other, this sentence of Shelley's could be regarded as saying that poetry celebrates life in all its forms as opposed to whatever kills life or is dead in life, which is self-evident. Taken otherwise, the "ritual" is only one of those childish and slapdash and picked-up affairs that Shelley indulged himself with. This "ritual" motif is an old stick from Voltaire on to beat the established order with. Ritual, with its powers inherent in repetition, hypnotic concentration, gradual emotional acceleration and so on, is one of the oldest aspects of religion, art and life. On its dead side it can be somnolent, mechanical and empty, exactly as its opposite, the evangelic spontaneity or improvisation, on its bad side can be hysterical and debauched. The theme is infantile.

Mr. Gregory's essay, after discussing the disasters that overtake Romantic behavior, in biography and otherwise, comes to a Shelley quotation:

> The monks in their cloisters were engaged in trifling and ridiculous disputes: they contented themselves with teaching the dogmas of their religion, and rushed forth to colleges and halls, where they disputed with an acrimony and meanness little befitting the resemblance of their pretended holiness.

This is quoted for a purpose, as we shall presently see. But in passing we may note what another confused or headlong piece of Shelley's it is (though Mr. Gregory will presently outdo him in that). Nobody ever denied that in medieval monasteries there were nonsense, acrimony, temper and weakness. We need waste no more time than it takes to remark that St. Francis came out of a monastery, and that, among trifles, the famous argument as to how many angels could stand on the point of a needle was in reality a dispute on spirit and matter. *Basta.*

The quotation serves Mr. Gregory to introduce the "neo-classic," which he sees spreading among us, and its "sponsors"—as a starter, say, Mr. Allen Tate's essay on "Poetry and Politics," in The New Republic of August 2, which Mr. Gregory takes to represent a minor climax in the point of view that has for its background the neo-Humanist controversy, critical reviews in The Hound and Horn and the now defunct Bookman, Mr. Archibald MacLeish's "Young Men of Wall Street"—which is nonsense; not only has Mr. Tate's point of view, as not infrequently expressed in reviews and essays, nothing to do with Mr. MacLeish's article; Mr. MacLeish has, in my opinion at least, a remarkable combination of surface clarity with muddled, declamatory content—and Mr. Davidson's anthology of essays by twelve Southerners, "I'll Take My Stand" (of these I should mention that I myself wrote the final essay, in case anyone should want to trace this article to that fact). Mr. Gregory then delineates the products of this neo-classic revival: a strange, hybrid animal, etc., with ambitions ultimately political, but at present attached to literature. (Later he says that these capitalistic priests of poetry and criticism, in their retreats, "wish to preserve the poetry of our time by locking it in airtight vaults," etc.) We read then of these men . . . dreams of an agrarian aristocracy before the Civil War . . . hope for a strong state, or a series of states, that will protect

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rights of existing landowners . . . would welcome fascism or even monarchy . . . "not unkind to the sense of order displayed in the ritual of the Roman Catholic Church, for it respects, above all else, its aspects of temporal power." If "its" refers to the hybrid animal—but that's impossible. If "its" refers to the Church, then ritual falls within the temporal—beat that for a thought!

These peculiarities change from day to day, Mr. Gregory says, and would not concern him in the least "if they were not directed against the human spirit which is the lifeblood of Shelley's poetry." He might better, I think, have called it the lifeblood of Shelley's poetic impulses. It is obvious that poetry should assume social responsibility. But the mere enthusiastic reception of the role may or may not lead to any reality in the shape of poetry. We learn then that readers of poetry are half-convinced that the art is dead. We learn that "criticism of poetry (now defined as a separate, narrow, archaic art) is given over to these priests of orthodoxy"—What is orthodoxy in poetry? And Mr. Gregory, at the thought of recent literary controversies, is reminded of whom? You may guess: again the monks—Shelley's.

The essay continues and sets up a straw man (of supposed items in the criticism under his fire) that is not worth knocking down. Among these straws, for example, there is one which says that "since a highly technical appreciation is necessary, it is implied that the "art of poetry is a ritual to be preferably enjoyed by the dilettante, by the gentleman of leisure." This amazing deduction, along with the stress on craft, is coaxed from Mr. Tate's assertions that humanitarianism is no substitute for the craft of poetry.

Prophetic assaults, bombastic, but in taste, shall we say, sub-classic, compose a passage of other themes: belonging to the ruling class, the refuge afforded poets—the Shelley monks again—and of course the poor, who seem to appear eating a foetus in the subway—a piece of passionate whimsy, this diatribe, that defeats itself. The poor are despised by the neo-classic gentlemen—as if some of these neo-classics were not as poor as Job's turkey themselves, and as if even a penniless gentleman did not know that the real poor are never vulgar. As to poetry belonging to the present, Mr. Gregory is, plainly, right. But we must keep clear the fact that one way to see poetry is to know it may be divided into two sorts: say, for example, we could take two poems each equal to the other in the sum of its power. One poem might sweep things before it for a day or for an epoch; one might distribute the power through centuries at a lower pressure—Browning and Herrick, for instance.

As to the triumph of the human spirit (see Shelley's theme of human perfectibility) over the past and its tyranny, which the poet so trumpeted and Mr. Gregory accordingly uses, that is another of those head-on usages, non-critical, sensational, of Shelley's. The human spirit triumphs over the past when it destroys whatever in the past has grown dead, and now denies life. The human spirit can triumph also over the present, destroying in it things dead, by preserving from or drawing on the past for what is alive there. What else does Simonides' poem mean?

Mr. Gregory follows with some admirable definitions of Shelley's position and poetry, great and small, excellently done. In one passage, however, in which Shelley, so long accused of lack of discipline, is set off against Pope, admired for his discipline by the neo-classic priests, we read, "If, as in the case of Pope, it is the mere perfection of a regulated line of verse, the problem becomes one of craftsmanship." But there is no such thing as the mere perfection of a regulated verse line: words are symbols of meanings, not objects in the sense that eggs and darts, regulated in a frieze, may be. This is one of those unhappy items that may often give the writer and in fact—we may think that over for Mr. Gregory's essay—the whole discussion, away.

Nevertheless it is a good thing that Mr. Gregory should have reminded us of the value to our poets just now in a "revaluation" of Shelley (to whom he adds Emerson and Whitman). I should like to add to that, perhaps, one fact: we need not assume that the general public does or ever did read poetry. And I should like to add one warning. Boiling sometimes precipitates the pure substance, sometimes only brings the scum to the top: poets undertaking our today should be told that some soft infancy of better hope in achievement may be got from their works' very subject matter; but that this optimism may be quite another thing from the hard universality of technical perfection or a poem created.

STARK YOUNG.

CORRESPONDENCE

Millions for Tribute

SIR: The last sixteen years have made abundantly clear, first, that the capitalist class is no longer competent to guide the destiny of nations, second, that it won't surrender without fighting.

Either the workers will win the fight, as in Russia—at the cost of a prolonged civil war, with millions killed and the entire productive plant of the country ruined; or else the capitalists will win as in Germany—at the cost of murders, book burnings, Jew baitings, universal spying; and, moreover, without solving any of the problems that brought about the crisis, so that the eventual solution will be an international war. These are the happy alternatives before us. The last sixteen years have ended all hopes of a peaceful evolution toward socialism. But haven't they also made it necessary for the revolutionary working-class parties to revise their tactics?

In Germany the Communists sang a song about greasing the guillotine—*"Schmier' die Guillotine."* They sang it so loudly that they terrified and united their opponents—and now their own heads are falling into the basket. They will some day have their revenge, but meanwhile they are paying heroically and tenfold for every mistake they made.

In all humility I suggest a new policy to the Third International. As soon as the Communists of any nation come within a measurable distance of seizing power (as in China in 1927, Germany in 1932, Cuba in 1933) let them say nothing of guillotines and firing squads. Instead let them make a formal offer to the capitalist class of that nation and to its leading capitalists as individuals. Even if the class rejected the offer, there would be individuals to accept it: thus, it would split the opposition and shorten the struggle.

Let the working-class party say, "Make peace, surrender your factories to the workers' government, go abroad, promise to engage neither in business nor politics. In return we will promise to pay you a fat income during your lives and your children's lives.

"We can run the country so much better without you that we can afford to be generous. We can produce so much that we are willing to give you the surplus of things we don't desire. We'll endow each of you with plenty of servants, chorus girls, cocktails, gigolos, candles to burn at both ends or offer to your Virgin, red nail-paint, mauve toilet paper, art for art's sake, a Cadillac V-16, a string of polo ponies—everything you need to make you wistful. All we ask is that you get out and keep out."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It might work, there's no telling. Our present owning and ruling class might be glad to migrate in a body to the Riviera (if the French would have them) or to Mallorca (if the Mallorquins would have them) and there devote themselves to art between *apéritifs* and leave the rest of us to get ourselves out of the mess they got us into.

Speaking seriously—even $100 million a year in annuities to former Morgan partners would be cheaper than the tiniest civil war.

New York City. ARTHUR M. MAGEE.

Pareto as Scientist

SIR: After reading in The New Republic of October 11 the *dispute between Mr. DeVoto and Mr. Novack over Pareto's* sociology, it seems to me necessary to question the importance of the fact that Pareto is praised by the Fascists. Many a prophet has been worshiped by a flock that did not understand him. Since when has a scientist been blamable as the result of a misapplication of his theories?

Speaking as one who detests the theories and methods of fascism, I should like to urge that Pareto be judged on the basis of his contribution to sociology. In my opinion no one has done more to make the study of society scientific. The important answer to Mr. Novack is that Pareto's theories explain not only the Fascist movement in Italy but also the Bolshevik success in Russia. The fact that he has been recognized by the one group and not the other is insignificant. The social scientist need only be thankful that Pareto has materially aided him in understanding the phenomenon which has occurred in Russia, Italy and Germany in the last fifteen years, and within twenty years of the writing of Pareto's "Treatise."

Washington, D. C. CLARK FOREMAN.

An Appeal to Reason

SIR: Your readers may be interested in an open letter I have written to Hans Heinz Ewers, Berlin, Germany, of which I enclose a copy.

Chicago, Ill. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

[ENCLOSURE]

Hans Heinz Ewers,
Berlin, Germany.

Dear Hans Heinz Ewers:

You will remember that in the winter of 1919 you wrote to The Dial, of which I was editor, asking for help in obtaining your release from Fort Oglethorpe where you had been interned. I wish that I could enclose your letter, so eloquent in its language and even its handwriting of the suffering which you had experienced there. I had no difficulty in believing your statement that you were literally going mad. You will remember that through the intercession of Norman Hapgood with the Attorney General you were speedily released on parole and came to New York, where American writers and publishers, notably Mr. B. W. Huebsch, tried to counteract the impression which you had necessarily formed of American hospitality.

For the behavior of our government toward you, toward Dr. Muck, toward other Germans, German-Americans, German sympathizers and countless victims of espionage and conspiracy, I have no apology to make. It was abominable. With a few scandalous exceptions, American writers condemned it, and it was a leading count in the indictment which they drew against the mean and rancorous spirit in which the Wilson administration, behind its lofty professions, chose to carry on the War.

The treatment accorded to you and other innocent people bears a striking resemblance to that of people in Germany today at the hands of the party in control of the government. We denied to Germans the benefits of civil and human rights. We confiscated their property by the frauds of the Alien Property Custodian's office. We subjected them to mob law without protection of the authorities. We declared them foes of civilization and denied them membership in the human race. Substitute Jew or Marxist for German, and the parallel your country offers today is complete.

It is with a deep sense of the wrong which was done in America, of which you were a victim, that I ask you to consider the wrong being done in Germany. American writers, artists, scientists and teachers are grieved by the plight of their German colleagues, subjected to confiscation, exile, imprisonment, hounded in some cases to madness or death. In particular are we concerned in the fate of literature, which Goethe recognized as an international force making for communication, understanding and unity among mankind. To the protests addressed to your government by literary bodies in this country I wish to add an appeal to German writers, to use their influence in behalf of their brethren, to take action to mitigate their hardships, to remove from their country the stain of intolerance and persecution toward literature, learning and the arts. I address my appeal to you on account of our previous association, because you are peculiarly fitted by your own experience to appreciate the sufferings of men of your profession, and by your position to take the lead in alleviating them.

Chicago, Ill. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

More about Lanier

SIR: Mr. Allen Tate's opinions of Sidney Lanier, expressed in The New Republic of August 30, might well be allowed to pass unchallenged were the presentation of them not accompanied by several misstatements, which seem curious in an article that begins, in scholarly fashion, by calling Lanier by his full baptismal name, which, not Professor Mims, but a later biographer, Dr. G. H. Clarke, was the first to reveal. Inasmuch as Mr. Tate's article constitutes, I believe, the first significant notice of Lanier in The New Republic, I beg space in which to correct some of the misconceptions of Lanier given New Republic readers by a perusal of Mr. Tate's article.

It is doubtful if Lanier's should be described as "a typical family of the Southern upper class," as such a description must suggest to many readers the plantation-owning class—the aristocratic class of fiction. Lanier's was a professional family. His paternal grandfather was (according to Professor Mims, whose biography was written with the assistance of members of the family) a successful "hotel-keeper"; his father and his maternal uncles were lawyers. Professor Mims calls his paternal great-grandfather Lanier "a well-to-do farmer," but not a planter.

Lanier did not "surrender with Lee at Appomatox" but spent the months of November, 1864-February, 1865, in Northern prisons, and did not rejoin the army after his release from prison. His imprisonment (which was chiefly responsible for his broken health and early death) is one of the significant facts in his history.

Dealers in first editions and rare books would, I think, dispute Mr. Tate's statement that Lanier's reputation is declining, for interest in his work seems to be reviving. Full proof that it is would be tedious, but it is not without significance that in a carefully selected Lanier bibliography fifty-one items are from the period 1900-16, forty-one from the period 1917-33—and the more important biographical articles would of course have appeared in the earlier period.

My "belief that Professor Mims had not done justice to the 'national' as opposed to the 'sectional' aspects of Lanier's 'thought' " is *not* the reason for my own study of Lanier. Professor Mims "intentionally emphasized" Lanier's "relation to the South"; I chose to emphasize "Lanier's importance as a national figure and his relations with men of national reputation." It is not at all a matter of "issue," but a matter of emphasis. The "reason" for my own study of Lanier is one Mr. Tate would not understand. But I do not recall that Lanier anywhere gives "authority" for the view of himself as "a figure on the model of Christ."

" 'The Poems of Sidney Lanier' (Scribner's, 1913)" is certainly *not* the "definitive volume" of Lanier's poems. Scribner's issued in 1884 a volume called "Poems of Sidney Lanier" (the omission of the article is noteworthy). Seven poems were added to the 1891 reprint of that volume, two more to the 1916 reprint. No second and no definitive edition of his poems has yet appeared (though hardly a year has passed without seeing a reprinting of the 1884-1891-1916 volume), much as a definitive edition is desired and needed. Mr. Tate's characterizations of the few poems

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he names are somewhat remarkable, but acceptable. His further statement that "they are the super-magazine poetry of a commonplace and confused mind" is not. Lanier's mind was often confused, commonplace never.

I find myself unable to ferret meaning from Mr. Tate's references to Lanier's flattery of "the industrial capitalism of the North" and of what Lanier himself called "Trade." Lanier's poem "The Symphony" has always seemed to me what Mr. Henry Steele Commager called it (in a review of "Liberalism in the South" in The New Republic of April 15, 1933) —"a savage indictment of industrialism." And Lanier as "a prophet foretelling only the blessings of our own age" and "a nineteenth-century leader who helped to make us what we are today" I cannot picture. Rather he seems a voice crying in the wilderness, warning of what we would become. The late Professor Parrington called Lanier "the first of our poets to cry out against [industrialism] as a deadly blight on life and civilization."

Finally I take pleasure in agreeing with Mr. Tate that Lanier's poetry "has never received any very precise critical evaluations," but I cannot feel that Mr. Tate has helped to dissipate the need of such evaluations.

Centralia, Ill. A. H. STARKE.

SIR: I am sorry that I made Lanier surrende with Lee. I am sorry, too, about that "definitive" edition of 1913; Mr. Starke has more bibliographical information about Lanier than I ever intend to acquire. Beyond these matters of fact I cannot see that Mr. Starke has discussed anything. But how absolute he is! We must speak by the card, or equivocation will undo us!

As to Lanier's increasing or decreasing reputation. Let the buyers of Lanier first editions continue to buy. The critical evaluation of a poet is rarely the result of popular vote.

Mr. Starke says that his reason for writing his book on Lanier "is one that Mr. Tate would not understand." This is true; the reason, for me, is shrouded in mystery. I supposed it was the issue of sectionalism vs. nationalism; but Mr. Starke says there was no issue—only an emphasis. It seemed to me that there was a real issue involved in defining nationalism and sectionalism. I tried to define Lanier's nationalism as the sectionalism of the North—which of course was the only kind of nationalism available in Lanier's time. I intimated that there might be a defect of intelligence (or worse) in naïvely accepting that kind of nationalism in the South. I agree that "The Symphony" is an indictment of industrialism. "The Psalm of the West" is praise of industrialism, for this simple reason: it is praise of "nationalism," *argal* of Northern sectionalism, *argal* of industrialism. I hope this is not too esoteric in its logic. We can reconcile the indictment and the praise only on the assumption that in neither case did Lanier quite know what he was talking about. This is evident in the *quality* of his poetry, which is pretentious, muddy and false. He was simply determined to be a poet, and he could say almost anything for the purpose. I did not mean, and I do not now intend, to accuse him of deliberate insincerity.

I am glad that Mr. Starke wishes to see honor bestowed where it is due: he points out that Professor Clarke, and not Professor Mims, discovered Lanier's middle name. But I do not think he should state this fact so that the public, which may not have read my essay, will think that I misstated it. I neither knew nor cared who made the discovery; I shall forget it by tomorrow. At any rate I said nothing about it in my essay.

Clarksville, Tenn. ALLEN TATE.

In Defense of a New Victim

SIR: With the days speeding toward November 27, the opening date for the trial of Athos Terzani, young anti-fascist accused of killing his comrade Anthony Fierro, the need of funds for the essential work of Terzani's defense becomes acute. Expense at this time is necessarily increased by the cost of investigation, which must be intensified to make certain that no vital piece of evidence is overlooked.

Terzani's accuser is "General" Art J. Smith, head of the Khaki Shirts of America, who recently gave himself up to the Philadelphia police on a fraudulent-conversion charge. Fierro was killed while defending a friend whom Smith was ejecting from a Khaki Shirt meeting in Astoria, New York. Although a Khaki Shirt member was pointed out as the slayer that night by two eyewitnesses, the man identified was permitted by the Queens County District Attorney's office to leave the state, while Terzani was held for the murder solely on the word of Smith.

District Attorney Charles S. Colden promised us on August 28 that he would "investigate the case further" in the light of new evidence we had put before him to substantiate our contention that a Khaki Shirt member murdered Fierro. But evidently that promise was only a gesture, since no representative of the District Attorney has yet interviewed individuals in Philadelphia whose names are in Colden's possession and who could furnish illuminating information about those who played chief parts in the Astoria tragedy.

The menace of this situation should be obvious to every intelligent person who knows what happened in the Mooney-Billings, Centralia and Sacco-Vanzetti cases. We cannot expect to get justice for Terzani in Queens County unless our committee is provided with means to search out every last fact involved.

Contributions should be sent to me at 94 Fifth Avenue.

HERBERT MAHLER,

New York City. Treasurer, Terzani Defense Committee.

Extracts from Letters

HARRY WEINBERGER, a counselor at law and a Single Taxer of New York City, brings up the question of taxing property as a way out of the city's financial dilemma. He wishes to ask Samuel Seabury, Mr. LaGuardia and others interested in the present mayoralty campaign why a one-percent tax on the land value of New York City should not be imposed for the support of the unemployed and the hungry. This land value, says Mr. Weinberger, was created by the city's people and at least part of the rental value should be returned to them.

Two groups have sent us appeals in behalf of the striking silk workers. The first, a local committee called the Citizens' Strike Relief Group, with headquarters at 105 Market Street, Paterson, New Jersey, is collecting funds to purchase milk for the children of striking textile workers in the Passaic Valley. Checks should be sent to the Paterson address. The second group is the Joint Silk Strikers' Relief Campaign, headed by Norman Thomas and backed by Heywood Broun, Roger Baldwin, Reinhold Niebuhr and others. Their letter emphasizes the fact that the sixty to seventy thousand silk workers out on strike in the East are desperately in need of aid, and appeals to our readers to send in money immediately to Relief Campaign headquarters at 112 East Nineteenth Street, Room 1101, New York City. This money will be used to establish relief kitchens and to purchase food and clothing for the strikers and their families.

Carol King, secretary of the International Juridical Association, writes in to announce that beginning with October 29, a series of Sunday evening lectures will be held on "Labor and the N.R.A." at the New School for Social Research, 66 West Twelfth Street, New York City. The principal speakers for the first lecture (the lecture starts at 8:15) will be Ordway Tead and Louis B. Boudin. Miss King invites our New York readers to attend the lectures; admission will be free and a number of distinguished speakers will appear during the winter. Should anyone wish further information about the lectures or the work of the Association, they may obtain it by writing to 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

In the face of the increasing number of lynchings in the South (during the months of August and September, it is reported there were fifteen lynchings in three Southern states) the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners announces that it is planning to send a delegation of trained Southerners into Tuscaloosa, Alabama, where they will investigate the recent killing of three Negroes. The National Committee is appealing for funds to cover the costs of the investigation and asks that checks or money be sent to headquarters at 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Checks should be made out to John Dos Passos, treasurer of the Committee.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Primer of Fascism

The Menace of Fascism, by John Strachey. New York: Covici, Friede. 272 pages. $2.25.

JOHN STRACHEY is today the ablest spokesman in England for revolutionary socialism. If the Fascists ever seize power there, his head will be the first to fall under the headsman's axe. He will be punished as a traitor to his class, as a member of the governing aristocracy who has gone over to the workers, as a ruler who has taken the side of the ruled.

In 1930 he was a Labor Member of Parliament assigned as Parliamentary Private Secretary to Sir Oswald Mosley. It was during the last disastrous Labor government. Mosley, under the direction of J. H. Thomas, had undertaken the task of reducing unemployment, which, on the contrary, was increasing week by week. Like Strachey himself, he had brought to the Treasury Chamber "a genuinely unsophisticated desire to do something"—but every proposal he made was blocked, first by the ineffectual Jim Thomas, then by the Civil Service and finally by the Labor party itself. The two young men, with a few sympathizers, decided to form a New party; they issued a program of "national planning" and "national reconstruction," a sort of Rooseveltian New Deal. The fate of their venture is a prophecy in miniature of what may happen here.

They intended to gain the support of both labor and capital, but it soon became evident that they must choose either one or the other. Mosley did not prolong his hesitation. In Ashton-under-Lyne, a Labor constituency, the New party first put forward a candidate for Parliament at a by-election. The candidate got only 4,000 votes, but these were enough to cause the defeat of his Labor opponent and elect a Conservative. A crowd of workingmen gathered in Ashton and hooted and roared at Mosley; he was in some danger of his life. Emotionally he was in the same position that Mr. Roosevelt may occupy when he faces the consequences of the strikes now breaking in higher waves over the country. "That is the crowd," Mosley said, "that has prevented anyone doing anything in England since the War."

He turned Right and began to seek support from the capitalists. A very few of his supporters, with Strachey as their leader, turned toward the Left. The break between the two factions came when Strachey was asked to prepare a memorandum outlining the New party's attitude toward Russia; he wrote a frankly pro-Russian document. Mosley rejected it, saying with equal frankness that if the New party inclined toward the Soviets it could expect no favors from rich and conservative Englishmen. Soon afterwards Mosley transformed his movement into the Union of British Fascists. Strachey, for his part, went farther and farther toward Moscow.

He has accepted all the implications of his new position, both in thought and action. Not only has he adopted a socialist philosophy: he has organized demonstrations, worked with labor unions and anti-war congresses, spoken to the unemployed from a platform in Hyde Park—and spoken well, according to the veteran Tom Mann, whose word is to be accepted. He has lived more or less as an agitator, all his life has reacted on his thought. "The Menace of Fascism" is a book that could not have been written except by a university graduate who was also a graduate of the street-corner platform. It has the intellectual rigor expected of the one, and the pounding straightforwardness demanded of the other. It is an advanced treatise on Fascism which reads as simply as a primer.

During the last century, Strachey says, the Western World has been ruled by a Great Hope, by the belief that "slowly, gradually, but surely, with only temporary setbacks, things would get better." This hope, as it applied to the laboring masses, came to be embodied in great progressive parties—the Social Democratic and Labor parties of Germany, Great Britain, France, Austria and Scandinavia. But for ten years these parties have everywhere been retreating, while at the same time the hope which they expressed has been fading from men's minds. Then came a sudden disaster. In Germany, the industrial country at the heart of Western Europe, power was seized by a party which proclaims "that the whole great hope . . . is a great illusion; that democracy is a decaying corpse; international peace, a coward's dream; equality of opportunity, a chimera; the conquest of poverty, a futile vision."

This is the negative side of Fascism: just what does it mean in positive terms? Strachey's answer is the most interesting part of his book.

Does Fascism mean, for example, the Corporate State? This question involves the more difficult question of what is the Corporate State. The proponents of that State are definite in their praises, but brief and vague in their statement of its actual nature. This "greatest constructive achievement of the mind of man," as Sir Oswald Mosley calls it, is supposed to combine the advantages of capitalism with those of socialism, yet without ever becoming socialistic. It "starts by sanctifying the possession of property." It does not involve governmental control or the "constant interference by government with the business of industry." How then does it work?

Italy should answer our question, for there the Corporate State was enacted seven years ago by a whole series of laws. But the Corporations authorized by these laws consist of nothing more than industrial-arbitration boards representing the employers and the employed—such boards as have long existed in many democratic countries. And in Italy these old-fashioned boards with a new name, these Corporations intended to serve as bulwarks of the Fascist state, *have never been set up.* The whole scheme is a paper scheme. "In other words," Strachey says, "the Corporate State is capitalism just as we know it today, with all its instability, its crises, its misery and its decay, plus a form of serfdom for the workers imposed by compulsory arbitration and the denial of the worker's right to withdraw his labor. Everything else is pure bluff."

Does Fascism mean a planned economy? But how can it plan! Strachey exclaims. It proposes to disturb neither private enterprise nor the private ownership of industry. Private enterprise and ownership are indissolubly connected with the prices-and-profits system of controlling production. But it is essential to a planned economy that production be controlled by some less haphazard method than prices and profits. A planned economy means that production is to be determined by the needs of the people at large—and this, in turn, is impossible unless the fields and mines and factories are publicly owned. Planning and private ownership mix no more than oil and water.

I might add that although Strachey devotes some space to proving this point, he doesn't devote enough. He fails to consider that under modern conditions the ownership and the control of industrial corporations are often in separate hands. Control is essential to planning; ownership may not be. On the other hand, the capitalists today are even less eager to surrender control than they are to surrender

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ownership—and in any case, the Fascists propose to leave them with both.

Is Fascism a revolt of the middle classes? Many observers have taken this position: Strachey thinks they are utterly wrong. "Fascism," he says, "is from the very beginning a movement owned and controlled by the very richest and biggest capitalists, who use the lower middle class and the peasants as their indispensable instruments for the destruction of the working class." Here again I think he simplifies too much; no movement can succeed by fooling everybody. Not all the middle-class youth who join a Fascist party are the mere dupes and instruments of their leaders; there are many who stand to gain by the coup d'état. Of course this statement does not apply to the vast majority, to the small tradesmen and farmers who are fighting to restore the conditions of the early nineteenth century; Fascism in practice merely accelerates the process that is leading to their ruin. But there are others who want things that Fascism can give—government jobs and army officerships and, above all, a path open to glory.

It is true that they get these things at a price that is paid by their own class. The price of the government jobs is the dismissal from the same jobs of other middle-class people, Jews and liberals—and also the loss of independence by the new jobholders themselves, who become the mere retainers of capitalist overlords. The price of the officerships is a vastly larger army and police force maintained by heavy taxation; and the army is used, like the police, for the purpose of suppressing that free culture which it is the pride of the middle class to enrich and preserve. As for the open path to glory, the price of it is war.

Is Fascism a revolution? No, Strachey says, the bankers and industrialists who controlled the government before the coup d'état continue to control it afterwards, but more firmly. Just how can we say that the Fascists seize power? "Only in the sense that they seize it from under their own pillows."

In what, then, does Fascism consist? Strachey, in order to answer this final question, restates that socialist analysis of the modern dilemma which has been so strikingly confirmed by the events of the last ten years. The socialists have said that the growth of scientific knowledge and technical achievement did not in itself, as the liberals supposed, ensure a steadily rising standard of life for the mass of humanity. They have held to the Great Hope, but they have seen the difficulties standing in its way, chief of which is the conflict between production for the masses and ownership by the few. They have said that unless we abolish the private ownership of the means of production, our technical progress will bring us, "not leisure and plenty, but unemployment and starvation; not international organization and peace, but new methods of warfare incomparably more destructive of civilization than the old."

The parties of progress, the Social Democratic and Labor parties, have refused to accept this analysis. They have recoiled from the task of seizing the factories and railroads, believing that the masses could eat their cake and let others have it. This, Strachey believes, is the explanation of their decay. But the Fascists, accepting the dilemma, have acted in the interest of the owning class. Fascism, in other words, must be defined "as the movement for the preservation by violence, and at all costs, of the private ownership of the means of production."

Having reached this definition—I must apologize for omitting most of the facts that led to it and quoting only the more significant or eloquent passages—Strachey uses it to project the future of Fascism. He does not believe that Mussolini or Hitler or their successors will ever willingly institute a system of autarchy, that is, of complete national self-sufficiency. Such a system would involve the abolition of exports as well as imports, whereas the Fascists have tried to stimulate exports at any cost. He does not believe that small trade and industry will really be encouraged at the expense of the chain stores and big factories, since mass production is essential to the preparation for war, and war is in turn essential to the Fascist state. The whole nation will be transformed into an offensive weapon—and Fascism will try to solve its economic difficulties by forcibly conquering new markets and new supplies of raw material and thereby relieving the tension at home.

Fascism under some new form may spread to France, Great Britain and the United States; and yet for Strachey the future is not unrelievedly black. The workers of the democratic countries may checkmate Fascism, not by defending their democratic rights in theory, but by putting them into practice and by using free speech and the right to organize as means of defeating the capitalists. Even if the whole world dresses itself in brown, black, blue or khaki shirts, he thinks it inconceivable that Fascism will be allowed to run its full course—for each of its wars will put an unbearable pressure on the workers and will at the same time give them arms. Each war will produce its working-class revolutions—"nor can we doubt for a moment that these revolutions will be successful." "Fascism," he concludes, "is the last defense of the capitalists. It is their last resort, their final throw. When Fascism fails, there is today no remaining defense for capitalism."

MALCOLM COWLEY.

Ancien Régime

Testament of Youth, by Vera Brittain. New York: The Macmillan Company. 661 pages. $2.50.

THE LIFE that was lived in childhood and adolescence by that generation of boys and girls who grew into young manhood and womanhood just before the outbreak of the War is deader than the age of Queen Anne, yet it is all less than a quarter of a century ago, and the people who belonged to it are still young or, anyway, young-middle-aged. But it was a doomed generation, and few of those who survived the War and the revolutions consequent on the War were ever really at home in the world afterwards. Their training, their ideas, their ideals, had been part of an age that was dead; the world got out of hand, for too few of that generation had known how to cope with it. They had been too young to know what they had been let in for in the War, but five years later they ought to have known what they were being let in for in the peace—why didn't they know? Something was wrong with them—with us, I should say as one of them—to have permitted the same ignorant men who had made the War and who had countenanced all the insane propaganda of the War to be those who made the peace.

This book by Vera Brittain is a great help toward understanding that generation and toward understanding, not only why the young were so thoroughly sacrificed in a democratic age, but why they permitted themselves to be so sacrificed. "Testament of Youth" is the account of the life of a typical girl of that doomed generation, belonging to the classes that used to be called the middle in the islands

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that used to be called the British. Though it differed in certain details and in certain national characteristics, the life was not very remote from that of a similar class in other European countries. Roughly speaking, all European civilization was the same for the same social classes; even the Russian landed gentry in the most eastern country in Europe—those who now in exile are running boarding houses and restaurants all over the world—lived almost exactly the same kind of life as the same class in the most western country in Europe, Ireland.

Though the great value of Vera Brittain's book lies in the fact that the life she records was typical, she herself has not the detachment from that life, nor a sufficient insight into history, nor sufficient power properly to assess what was beyond doubt one of the most foolish ages in history. Probably nobody living has these qualifications, nor will have until that generation which fought the War and which is now making opinion and coming into the control of affairs is either superannuated or dead. It is beginning in some countries to throw up leaders of a kind, though itself grew up in an age bankrupt in leadership—a transition age, when one period in the history of civilization was dying, though nobody was aware of it in spite of all the omens, or was prepared for the age that was coming to birth.

There is an unreality, a folly about the whole period, about the lives people lived and the things they did, that is only equaled by the follies of the regime before the French Revolution. The array of social classes alone was fantastic —the various gradations of aristocracy, below them the various gradations of middle classes, below them the gradations of working classes. The snobbery in the monarch-ruled countries, particularly in England and Germany, was infantile in its silliness and in the affectations it produced. There were highly organized absurdities of habits and training. Young men and women cultivated lisps, specialized gaits, specialized pronunciations—even specialized vulgarities—to mark the refinements of their social class; little girls in the monarch-ruled countries, even of a class that was never destined to see the inside of a royal court, were taught in boarding schools how to comport themselves at a royal presentation, how to make a presentation curtsey and walk out backwards from the presence of the sovereign, but when they grew up there were almost no monarchs left before whom they could practise their accomplishments.

Each country in addition had its own specialized form of sillinesses: in the British islands women placed the most fantastic value on the privileges which they had not got; the vote which was supposed to enable them to change the universe once they got it was fought for by methods almost incredible in their hysteria—they burned houses, destroyed mailboxes, chained themselves to pillars, threw themselves in front of horses at race-meetings, tried to blow up government buildings and to kill Prime Ministers. They went to lengths unbelievable now to get a college education, though for many of them the learning acquired was only a sort of enamel which did nothing whatever to the minds beneath it. Oxford and Cambridge Universities permitted them to pass the examinations but not to attach B. A. or M. A. to their names—this sacred privilege was reserved for the males. Nearly all of the women had the sort of difficulties Miss Brittain records with the male members of their families before they were allowed to go to the institutions of higher learning. Those who went through them discussed Kant's theory of survival with their young men friends ("Testament of Youth," page 90) or wrote them letters about Light and Truth, Plato and Homer (page 218), though probably what most of them really understood about any of these would have fitted in the eye of a needle. What they all really understood and what they all read was a book by Olive Schreiner called "The Story of an African Farm"; the young men compared themselves to the hero and their girl friends to the heroine. And, as Miss Brittain says, her life was typical. It was—all that generation did, said and wrote the same things. They were all dreamers; they drew their ideas and ideals, not from reality, not from experience, not from history, but from romantic literature and the social and political theories of the nineteenth century. They went forth to battle urged by meaningless catchwords—"A war to end war," "To make the world safe for Democracy," "A war for Civilization."

Of course Americans of that generation suffered less than Europeans; very few people in this country can have had Miss Brittain's history—she lost in the War her only brother, her fiancé, and all their young men friends; she spent her girlhood nursing war-wounded men, German prisoners among others, and when her service was over she returned to her Oxford college and was made to feel, like other veterans of the World War, that "Survivors Were Not Wanted" (Chapter X). If the survivors were not wanted in the conquering countries, what greeting could have met the poor survivors who returned to the conquered countries, or those ravaged by revolution, and who also had been fighting a war to end war, etc., or to make their country safe for something.

"Each age is a dream that is dying, or one that is coming to birth," wrote O'Shaughnessey. But in most other ages there were leaders who knew what was dying and what was coming to birth; in 1914 nobody knew at all.

MARY M. COLUM.

In a Vermont Village

Bonfire, by Dorothy Canfield. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

ANNA CRAFT, the district nurse of the little town of Clifford, used to fight her hereditary melancholy —which she got from the Knapp side of the family—by entering deeply into the lives of the people around her, seeing their world through their eyes and participating in their problems. The reader of "Bonfire" is insensibly drawn into a similar participation. Mrs. Canfield's Vermont village is a microcosm in which the destinies of human beings clash and interweave in the shocking and incalculable way of life everywhere. The novel deals with a group of widely different people, recognizable at once as real, in a cross section of their lives, as they blindly react upon each other, and are warped, ravaged or healed, but always profoundly changed by early influences, by love, ambition or resentment, by frustrations, by physical and spiritual deficiencies or triumphs. Some are only onlookers, but even onlookers have power.

The cross-currents of life in this small homogeneous community are inextricably intertwined. Anna, who has no religion but lives for others until she finds out that there are subtle dangers in selfless devotion, Cora, the unattractive woman who loves her, Fred Kirby, the Anglo-Catholic whose birth-marked face has led him to despair of human love, Anson Craft, ruined by his passion for the strangely evil Lixlee, Isabel emerging from the torment of her love for Anson to a self-created strength which enables her to piece together the remnants of their lives into something faintly resembling a vital pattern, Miss Gussie, the wise

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deaf woman who watches people's expressions and sees much more than those whose sight is weakened by too much hearing, and many others exemplify here once more the impotence of intention, the fateful significance of trivial and accidental happenings, the eternal loneliness of human beings, veiled now and then by the temporary radiance of illusion. The story has roots and native character; it has both a regional and a general truth and beauty. It is Mrs. Canfield's most richly felt and finely written novel.

CLARA G. STILLMAN.

A Scholar's Plato

What Plato Said, by Paul Shorey. The University of Chicago Press. 693 pages. $5.

THE TITLE "What Plato Said" is both a promise and a rebuke. The promise is handsomely fulfilled in that Professor Shorey distills, out of a lifetime of devotion to Plato, a résumé of all the Platonic writings, including, besides the genuine dialogues, the doubtful and spurious ones and the epistles. The rebuke applies to that host of experts, propagandists and theorizers who have managed to expound and apply their selected passages until Plato has become the reputed source of half the world's delusions and prejudices.

Platonic literature is already stuffed with mere paraphrases of the more popular dialogues, but Professor Shorey's account adds to inclusiveness a generous sprinkling of comment and interpretation. There is a tendency, however, to give more attention to specific topics within a dialogue than to the general purpose or effect of the dialogue as a whole. This is of particular importance in dramatic dialogues, such as the "Phaedo" and "Symposium," where Plato's artistry is as much revealed in the sequence of events as in the contents of speeches.

In the "Phaedo" the dramatic situation involving the death of Socrates is said to provide only a suitable framework for the ideas, but not an organic unity on which the ideas depend. Hence Socrates' impending death is regarded as the *leitmotif*, and arguments about immortality become the theme. However, the dialogue opens with the query, "How did he die?" and ends, after convincing no one of immortality, with Socrates' enigmatic last words and Phaedo's remark, "Such was the end of our comrade." Plato created a feeble treatise on immortality but an immortal drama on dying.

In the "Symposium" Shorey calls the Socratic speech on love the climax, and the irruption of the drunken Alcibiades is called an afterpiece which relieves that climax. Here, again, the importance of the dramatic use of incidents has been neglected. The earlier speeches have suggested the dual nature of love; Socrates' oration eclipses them but is part of the ascending theme; the sudden confronting of the abstract vision of beauty with its concrete copy gives the dialogue a more powerful climax than can be found simply in what the participants say. The real afterpiece is given when Socrates goes home sober. Professor Shorey has admirably disclosed the political, the moral and the dialectical Plato; the dramatic portrayer of philosophers at work has somewhat eluded him.

The summaries of the "Gorgias," "Theaetetus" and "Timaeus" are particularly lucid and provocative. The brief and rather casual treatment of the "Apology" and "Parmenides" is disappointing. Shorey endeavors to enliven the "Laws" by spiking his long synopsis with a jiggerful of modern allusions and quotations, but that

BORZOI BOOKS

The Intelligent Man's Review of EUROPE TODAY
by G. D. H. COLE
author of "A Guide Through World Chaos"
and MARGARET COLE

A complete picture of the European scene brought right up to date—its politics, governments, and social systems—its problems of industry, trade, and finance—its fear of war, its hope of peace, its danger spots—all clearly, simply written, so that everyone may know just what is going on in each European country and in Europe as a whole. "A book of the utmost value," says *H. J. Massingham.* "A work of high intellectual enterprise," says *J. A. Hobson.* Over 600 pages, $3.00

The Collected Verse of ROBERT HILLYER

All the poetry of a distinguished American poet, in one volume. $2.00

The Brown Book of the HITLER TERROR

348 pages, 20 photographs. $2.50

THOMAS MANN'S new volume of essays PAST MASTERS

Timely subjects and timeless ones. The great Nobel Prize winner and author of *The Magic Mountain* has written here on "Culture and Socialism," on "Cosmopolitanism," on "The Sufferings and Greatness of Richard Wagner," on Tolstoi, Goethe, Spengler, Nietzche, Freud, and others. $2.50

BEHIND THE DOCTOR
by LOGAN CLENDENING
author of "The Human Body"

The fascinating, heroic story of medicine through all human history. 458 pages, 147 photos. $3.75

At all Bookshops

ALFRED·A·KNOPF
PUBLISHER NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I wish I could
QUIT WORK
and LIVE
on a FARM!"

Are you sick of worrying about your job? Would you like to become self-supporting in the country—find comfort, security and independence for yourself and your family with only a few hundred dollars capital? Now a man who has done just that for the past dozen years tells you in detail *how* you can follow his example. Thousands of people have already found the "way out" in the pages of his book. "The most heartening book we have ever read, bar none! Points out a means of adopting a way of life for which most readers have longed hopelessly."—*Cincinnati Enquirer.* $2.50
at all bookstores or direct from the publishers.

By Ralph Borsodi

FLIGHT from the CITY

HARPER & BROTHERS
49 EAST 33 STREET NEW YORK CITY

DANCE WITH THE STARS! at the COSTUME
THEATRE BALL
WEBSTER HALL • 119 EAST 11 STREET
SATURDAY, Nov. 4
BENNY CARTER'S ORCHESTRA
W. C. HANDY — KING OF JAZZ
BENEFIT THEATRE UNION
104 Fifth Avenue—Algonquin 4-0580
Ticket in advance $1 — at door $1.50. Reserved boxes
SURPRISE AT MIDNIGHT
Tickets on sale at: Theatre Union, 104 Fifth Ave.; Drama Bookshop, 48 W. 52nd St.; Rand Book Store, 7 E. 15th St.; Workers Bookshop, 50 E. 13th St.

Current Events Lecture Series Friday, October 27, 8:30 o'clock
JAY LOVESTONE
Secretary, Communist Party U. S. A. (Opposition)
will discuss the Significance and Effects of
U. S. RECOGNITION OF SOVIET RUSSIA
Friday, October 27, 7 P. M. "Gestaltism and Atomism—A Marxian Interpretation," Bertram D. Wolfe.
Sunday Forum, October 29, 8 P. M. "Is America Going Fascist?"—Roger Baldwin.
RIVERA HALL, NEW WORKERS SCHOOL,
51 West 14th Street, New York Admission, 25c each lecture

THE NEW YORK PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE
324 West 86th Street
announces a lecture entitled
THE MARITAL RELATIONSHIP
by Dr. CLARENCE P. OBERNDORF
Friday, October 27th, at 8:30 P. M. Admission, $.75

treatise remains, Shorey's patient and able advocacy notwithstanding, next to "The Faërie Queene" the dullest "masterpiece" in European literature.

Although Professor Shorey is noted for accuracy in translation and paraphrase, he occasionally invites the reader to chuckle with him over a bold and refreshing liberality of rendition. For example, he has Callicles in the "Gorgias" call morality "conventional window-dressing, piffle and moonshine"; and has Polus conclude his tirade against Socrates by calling him a "hayseed and a fundamentalist." Some fastidious scholars object to permitting Plato a seasonal venture into modern slang, but even Socrates did not always employ the language of the gods when speaking to their human shadows. One of the merits of Shorey's narration is his enviable facility for temperately balancing learning with good sense, precision with metaphor, the universal with the colloquial—avoiding gracefully the extremes of fussiness and flippancy.

The notes which follow the résumés display an intricate and catholic scholarship and constitute a third of the book. Their major purpose is to supply cross-references which relate corresponding opinions in the various dialogues. They succeed also in piling up evidence to support the hypothesis which Shorey has defended for a generation: that Plato's thought is essentially unified rather than evolutionary and that a genuine understanding of the pattern of Plato's philosophy does not depend on a reading of the dialogues according to a special scheme of priority and development.

J. V. Mauzey.

Book Notes

Reference

EVERYMAN'S ENCYCLOPEDIA, edited by Athelstan Ridgway. *New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 12 vols. 9,221 pages. $30.*

We owe an apology to our readers for having carried no mention of "Everyman's Encyclopedia," the last volume of which was published a year ago. The fact is that the literary editor took the twelve volumes home and put them to the practical test of service on his shelves. He can now report that they stood the trial successfully; "Everyman's" is a small, inexpensive, usable encyclopedia which, in its own field, has no rivals.

This is not equivalent to saying that it has no faults: it has many. Chief of these is a certain inaccuracy of statement and statistics, doubtless to be explained by the limited funds available to the staff. This inaccuracy is greatest in items having to do with the United States. The American editor is described as being "a graduate of the University of Virginia," a title which is not necessarily a passport into the world of encyclopedic learning. At any rate, Mr. Milton Bronner (B.A., Va.) let a good many mistakes get past him—as, to give a single example typical of many, his statement regarding Mt. Overlook in the Catskills that "an hotel, erected on the last-named peak, stands at an elevation of 3,800 ft." The hotel was destroyed by fire ten years ago. If it stood 3,800 feet above sea level, it must have floated in the air some 650 feet above the highest rock on Mt. Overlook.

A more general criticism is that the staff of the encyclopedia leans backwards in the direction of English conservatism. They conceive of history as a collection of kings and battles (with the dates of each). They reveal a deep-seated prejudice in every line they have written about Russia. Even in the field of biography, where "Everyman's" is usually first-rate, only twenty-five lines are devoted to Karl Marx, and thirty-four to Mary the Virgin, who follows him alphabetically—whereas a slightly tarnished brass hat like Kitchener of Khartoum gets two and one-half pages.

On the other hand, the encyclopedia has virtues which more than overbalance its faults. Most of the biographical items are concise and excellent. Science and mechanics are well treated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in brief, comprehensible entries, illustrated for the most part with simple line drawings; the science editor, Mr. E. J. Holmyard, deserves high praise. There is no general index, but the arrangement of topics is so clear that none is really needed. The typography, too, is commendable. Each volume measures 5 x 7¾ inches and, though containing about 766 pages, is only 1¼ inches thick, so that the whole set occupies only sixteen inches of a small shelf. The only criticism of the binding is that a better quality of gold leaf might have been used on the backs; after a year on the editor's shelves, the titles are getting dim. But this is a minor fault. It is enough to say that for people who haven't space for a larger encyclopedia, or money to buy it, "Everyman's" is strongly to be advised.

That Century of Progress

CHECAGOU: 1673-1835, by Milo M. Quaife. *University of Chicago Press. 222 pages. $1.*

Twenty years ago, Mr. Quaife wrote a history of Chicago similar to this one. Since that time he has made further studies and uncovered additional material. In his present history he opens with the statement that "Although Marco Polo never heard of Chicago, its story really begins with him." This is followed by a few paragraphs about Rome and Greece, after which Mr. Quaife deals with the settlement of Chicago, carrying his narrative down to 1835—just after the settlement had been incorporated as a village, and after the Indians, holding a final grand carousal, departed from the regions to go further westward. This is about as good a brief volume on the early history of Chicago as one can procure.

CHICAGO'S GREAT CENTURY: 1833-1933, by Henry Justin Smith, with a foreword by Rufus C. Dawes. *Chicago: Consolidated Publishers, Inc. 198 pages. $1.*

This book, authorized by "A Century of Progress," is largely a brief restatement of what Mr. Smith has already said of Chicago in his previous volumes. Its preponderant emphasis is placed on expansion and civic virtue, and much is made of the vision shown by Chicago leaders, bankers and other business men who have supported projects of municipal improvement. Mr. Smith also gives considerable space to the continued increases in census figures, bank deposits, the height of buildings, the number of industries and businesses in the city, and the addition of parks, playgrounds and boulevards. Labor troubles, gang murders and political corruption, on the other hand, are treated as transient and forgivable blemishes.

AS OTHERS SEE CHICAGO: Impressions of Visitors, 1673-1933, edited by Bessie Louise Pierce. *The University of Chicago Press. 563 pages. $3.*

This is a compilation of what Jacques Marquette, Rudyard Kipling, Paul Bourget, Waldo Frank and many others have thought of Chicago, with the impressions selected and edited so as to reflect due credit on the city. It is cleverly edited and contains a good bibliography.

CHICAGO ON PARADE, by Herman O. Duncan. *Chicago: Herman O. Duncan, 1414 East 59th Street. 16 pages. 25 cents.*

The sixty photographs in this little pamphlet are the most effective answer to the World's Fair publicity that has yet appeared. Below pictures of a breadline and of the unemployed stretched out like casualties after a battle, in Grant Park, there is this quotation from a speech by Rufus C. Dawes: "The day has come for which we have prepared so long." Nine photographs show the famous tower of the Sky Ride as it looks from nine separate slums. Eight photographs of peculiarly wretched Hoovervilles carry this apt caption, the glowing tribute of Mayor Kelly: "Here, architecture and coloring throw off the fetters that have previously bound them." Eight more remarkable photographs show crowds of people searching through garbage dumps—one shows a line of men waiting for a garbage truck to be emptied. The photographs are clear and well reproduced; the captions are chosen with a bitter art from speeches on the Century of Progress Exposition.

● *A Story of REAL life with all the thrill and appeal of great fiction.*

Testament of Youth

by VERA BRITTAIN

"Heartbreakingly beautiful!"
—R. L. DUFFUS *(N. Y. Times Sunday Books)*

•

"If ever there was a book to explain one generation to another, *this* is it!"
—EDWARD WEEKS *(Atlantic Monthly)*

•

"Better than a dozen volumes of memoirs of statesmen and generals."
—JOHN CHAMBERLAIN *(N. Y. Times)*

•

"NO fictitious record could furnish more dramatic material than this autobiographical chronicle . . . an incalculably powerful influence in the war against war."
—Saturday Review of Literature

$2.50

Outstanding Fiction

Mandao, Mandao! *by Winifred Holtby*
"A sheer, refreshing delight!"
—Sat. Rev. of Lit. $2.50

The Avatars *by A. E.*
"Rare tissues of a poetic and mystic mind."
—N. Y. Times. $1.50

Bride of Quietness *by Alexander Knox*
"A deeply moving story told with rare understanding."
—N. Y. Herald Tribune. $2.00

Sing to the Sun *by Lucille Papin Borden*
A thrilling romance of St. Francis, and medieval Italy. $2.00

Nancy Owlett *by Eden Phillpotts*
Another colorful Dartmoor novel; illustrated by Charles E. Brock. $2.50

A Wicked Woman *by Anne Austin*
Poignant, thrilling and human—the story of a mother's sin. $2.00

The Curtain of Storm *by Joseph Gollomb*
Galt, the "Goldfish" of famous mysteries, returns again. $2.00

Eyes of the Wilderness *by Charles G. D. Roberts*
Best new stories of "The O. Henry of the Animal World." $1.90

At any bookstore

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contributors

H. N. BRAILSFORD, the distinguished British journalist, is the author of several books, the latest being "Rebel India," which was printed in The New Republic Doliar Series.

WITTER BYNNER is a poet and playwright who has published a number of books of verse and translations, those from the Chinese being particularly well known. He has been living in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

LEON TROTSKY, the Russian revolutionist, is now living as an exile in southern France.

AMOS PINCHOT, lawyer, publicist and a frequent contributor to American journals, was a lifelong friend and admirer of George Record.

MARY M. COLUM is returning from the south of France, where she spent a year on a Guggenheim fellowship. Beginning with the November issue she will contribute a monthly book page to The Forum.

CLARA G. STILLMAN is the author of "Samuel Butler: A Mid-Victorian Modern," which the Viking Press brought out last year. She frequently contributes reviews and critical articles to magazines.

J. V. MAUZEY, author of "Montaigne's Philosophy of Human Nature," is now writing a book on "The Philosophy of Montaigne." He is assistant professor of Philosophy at St. Stephen's College of Columbia University.

A First Hand Account

CUBA REVOLTS

Gunboats vs. Independence

M. MARSAL — Correspondent *El Pais*
M. GOMEZ — Journalist
CARLETON BEALS
WALDO FRANK

At: New School for Social Research — 66 West 12th Street, N. Y. C.
Friday, Nov. 3rd at 8:30 P. M. Promptly
Admission: 55c (including tax); Reserved seats: $1.10

Auspices:
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners
156 Fifth Avenue (at 20th St.)—Room: 534 Tel.: CHelsea 2-9593

O. G. Villard	*Joseph McGoldrick*
Padraic Colum	*Clinton Seymour*
H. A. Overstreet	*John Erskine*
Carleton Beals	*C. Hartley Grattan*
L. M. Hacker	*Paul Horgan*
A. David Gould	*Alvah Bessie*
Harvey O'Connor	*Samuel Chotzinoff*
Forbes Watson	*C. M. Adams*
John O'Hara	*Frank Tannenbaum*

A. Fenner Brockway

THESE ARE SOME OF THE CONTRIBUTORS

to the New

EAGLE

Sunday Magazine

First Issue October 29th

An intensely absorbing magazine for people who are interested in living, in knowing, and in reading. Devoted to a wide range of intellectual topics . . . controversial opinion, the arts, the theatre, and stories of exceptional literary style. The Brooklyn Eagle, one of New York's foremost newspapers, announces the new Eagle Sunday Magazine . . . to be included with its Sunday edition every week . . . all for one low price, 5c in Greater New York.

brilliant! analytical! entertaining!

Published every Sunday as part of the

Brooklyn Eagle

5c IN GREATER NEW YORK

THEATRE

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*
EUGENE O'NEILL'S comedy
AH, WILDERNESS!
with GEORGE M. COHAN
GUILD THEA. Fifty-second Street West of Broadway
Eves. 8:20—Mats. Thurs. & Sat. at 2:20

MOLIERE'S COMEDY WITH MUSIC
The School for Husbands
Adapted in rhyme by
Arthur GUITERMAN and Lawrence LANGNER
Music by Edmond W. RICKETT
EMPIRE THEATRE, BROADWAY and 40th STREET.
Eve., 8:30; Mat. Thurs., Sat., 2:30.

MOTION PICTURES

Renè Clair's
SUCCESSOR TO "SOUS LES TOITS DE PARIS"
"JULY 14"
Little CARNEGIE PLAYHOUSE ("Quatorze Juillet")
57th Street East of 7th Avenue *Continuous—Popular Prices*

Beginning Friday, October 27th
FIRST AMERICAN SHOWING OF AMKINO'S
"THREE THIEVES" The most daring satire on capitalist society ever filmed
Produced by Mejrabpomfilm in the U.S.S.R.
ACME THEATRE | 14th St. & Union Sq. | Phone:ALg: 4-9620 | *The Rendezvous of the Intelligentsia.*

POSITIONS WANTED

Position by middle-aged, trustworthy man. Chauffeur—handy with tools, good painter and carpenter. Would take care of an estate or be companion to semi-invalid. Good home rather than high wages. Address: Box 778, The New Republic.

Literary Assistance. Editing, revision, collaboration and ghost-writing. Articles, stories and books. Woman of experience wishes part- or full-time work. Credentials furnished. Address: Box 780, The New Republic.

EXOTIC
Short Stories translated from the French, German, Italian, Spanish, etc. Published Quarterly—1420 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
25 cents a copy—5 issues for $1.00.
On sale at principal newsstands.
MAGAZINE

READ RARE BOOKS

Members read without buying rare, scarce, out-of-print books; limited, privately printed editions, unexpurgated translations. Write for information giving age and occupation.
ESOTERIKA BIBLION SOCIETY
"DEPT. C-6" 15 East 45th Street, New York

FOR RENT

For Artist or writer—studio cottage, five hours from New York—secluded yet accessible, summer and winter. 3 rooms, plainly furnished, bath, furnace, electricity. Very low rent includes electricity and water. Photographs on request. Address: Box 779, The New Republic.

SPEND DELIGHTFUL FALL VACATION on large colonial estate. Private golf course. Tennis. Large oak woods. Open fire places. Best of southern cooking. Reduced rates. Weekly, $10 up to $15 with private bath. Seven hours from New York.
MAJOR MARSHALL MacDONALD
Media Farm, Charles Town,
West Virginia, Jefferson County

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED